DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 118 UD 018 817

TITLE State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America.

INSTITUTION Iowa State Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Des Moines.; Kansas State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.; Missouri State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.; Nebraska State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

PUB DATE Jun 78

NOTE 119p.; Parts may be marginally legible due to print quality

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; *Employment Practices; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Females; Job Training; Minority Groups; Racial Discrimination; Recruitment; Sex Discrimination; *State Agencies; *State Government; State Surveys; *Statistical Data

IDENTIFIERS Iowa; Kansas; Missouri; Nebraska

ABSTRACT

Presented in this document is a study undertaken by four State Advisory Committees to review the quality and the effectiveness of affirmative action activities in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. An overview of the four States' agencies responsible for education administration, employment services, highways, police, and social services indicates that no State exhibits consistent success or consistent failure. Almost all agencies reviewed, however, are shown to be consistent in their underutilization of women and minorities. In addition, Federal agencies with monitoring responsibilities and/or funding capabilities are found to have made only minimal efforts to compel affirmative action and to have not used their authority over funds to promote affirmative action efforts by State governments. Findings, recommendations, and conclusions of the Advisory Committees are presented for the areas of recruiting, hiring, training, and the promotion of full representation of minorities and women in public sector employment. Appendices provide information on race and sex composition of State agencies, and a comparison of State and agency affirmative action plans with a model plan. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America

—A report prepared by the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska Advisory Committees to the United States Commission on Civil Rights

JUNE 1978

ED163118

CG013817

ATTRIBUTION:

The findings and recommendations contained in this report are those of the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska Advisory Committees to the United States Commission on Civil Rights and, as such, are not attributable to the Commission. This report has been prepared by the State Advisory Committees for submission to the Commission, and will be considered by the Commission in formulating its recommendations to the President and the Congress.

RIGHT OF RESPONSE:

Prior to the publication of a report, the State Advisory Committees afford to all individuals or organizations that may be defamed, degraded, or incriminated by any material contained in the report an opportunity to respond in writing to such material. All responses have been incorporated, appended, or otherwise reflected in the publication.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska
Advisory Committees to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
June 1978

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION
Arthur S. Flemming, *Chairman*
Stephen Horn, *Vice Chairman*
Frankie M. Freeman
Manuel Ruiz, Jr.
Murray Saltzman

Louis Nuñez, *Acting Staff Director*

Sirs and Madam:

The four Advisory Committees of the Central States Region—Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska—have joined to do this study of affirmative action efforts by their State governments. All four Committees have been concerned by the failure of State government to take the lead in showing what can be done to ensure equal employment opportunity and by the failure of Federal authorities to use their funding leverage to promote change.

The absence of complete data on the composition of the available State labor force has caused the Advisory Committees to use a surrogate measure of the State labor force, the State work force. This surrogate would not have been necessary if States had conducted State governmentwide underutilization analyses, as part of which they would have measured the characteristics of the available labor force.

In their analysis of specific procedures, the Advisory Committees have concluded that recruitment efforts need to be significantly strengthened. The Advisory Committees accept the Commercial Clearinghouse proposition that for higher skilled jobs recruitment efforts beyond the normal recruitment area should be considered. There is little evidence that States or agencies have attempted these nationwide or regionwide searches for the best qualified candidates, yet such searches are necessary both to maintain high standards in the public service and to produce adequate representation of minority and female candidates for all posts. The mechanism for such efforts already exists in the four-State MIKN Selection Information Exchange.

Affirmative action hiring procedures must also be strengthened. The use of only content validation for tests is unjustifiable given the existence of a regional consortium which is capable of preparing tests and conducting statistically acceptable, criteria-based, validation studies legally sufficient to meet the requirements of all Federal reviewers.

For many minorities and women, lack of training or previous job experience has proved a barrier to entry into the public service. Although all four States' agencies have indicated an interest in creating appropriate entry level positions, few have taken the necessary steps to create such posts. Yet only through such posts can those who have been deprived acquire the credentials necessary for upward mobility in the State service.

The existence of effective career ladders that eliminate dead end jobs is essential for all State government employees, and especially for the minorities and women who are most likely to be trapped by the failure to take action in this regard. Yet the Advisory Committees have noted little progress in this area.

Many of the agencies reviewed receive Federal funds and are subject to Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as amended. Some are subject to the provisions of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. All are subject to the provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. Yet the Advisory Committees found that Federal agencies with monitoring responsibility have made minimal efforts to compel effective affirmative action. Similarly, Federal agencies with funding capability have not used their authority over those funds to promote to the maximum extent possible affirmative action efforts by State governments.

The Advisory Committees acknowledge that the courts have set limits on what employers can be required to do in the pursuit of equal employment opportunity. However, public agencies funded with public funds must take all possible steps to ensure full representation of minorities and women. Much remains to be done and must be done by public employers to promote real equal opportunity by recruiting, hiring, training, and promoting minorities and women so that they are fully represented in public sector employment.

Respectfully,

Peg Anderson, *Chairperson*
Iowa Advisory Committee

Constance L. Menninger, *Chairperson*
Kansas Advisory Committee

Paul Smith, *Chairperson*
Missouri Advisory Committee

Michael B. Adams, *Chairperson*
Nebraska Advisory Committee

Membership

IOWA ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Peg Anderson, *Chairperson*
Cedar Falls

Harold E. Butz
Des Moines

Allen J. Correll
Des Moines

John M. Ely, Jr.
Cedar Rapids

John M. Estes, Jr.
Des Moines

Signi Falk
Cedar Rapids

Lee B. Furgerson
Des Moines

William E. Gluba
Davenport

Louise H. Goldman
Davenport

Carol A. Kramer
Newton

Raymond R. Leal
Iowa City

Naomi S. Mercer
Des Moines

Stephanie L. Michael
Des Moines

Irene Munoz
Muscatine

Paula S. Schaelich
Ames

Joanne D. Soper
Sioux City

Robert A. Wright
Des Moines

Mose Waldinger
Des Moines

Membership

KANSAS ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Constance L. Mensinger, *Chairperson*
Topeka

Billy J. Burgess
Lawrence

Carlos F. Cortes
Kansas City

Al-Donna Daniels
Kansas City

Benjamin H. Day
Leavenworth

Jackie Gossard
Wichita

Dwight D. Henderson
Kansas City

Rayna F. Levine
Overland Park

Herman D. Lujan
Lawrence

Marston McCluggage
Lawrence

Connie A. Peters
Wichita

Thomas E. Punzo
Lawrence

Magdalena F. Rodriguez
Kansas City

George Rogers
Wichita

Ruth G. Shechter
Shawnee Mission

Forrest Swall
Lawrence

Membership

MISSOURI ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Paul Smith, *Chairperson*
St. Louis

Gail Achtenberg
Kansas City

Betty Adams
Jefferson City

Sterling G. Belcher
St. Louis

Arthur A. Benson II
Kansas City

Anita L. Bond
St. Louis

John Buechner
Kirkwood

Joanne M. Collins
Kansas City

James A. DeClue
St. Louis

Charles Duffy
St. Louis

Hedy Epstein
St. Louis

John B. Ervin
St. Louis

Elizabeth R. Gutierrez
Kansas City

Elsie A. Hall
St. Louis

David R. Humes
Hayti

Ruth K. Jacobson
St. Louis

Myron Marty
St. Louis

Joe L. Mattox
Kansas City

Marian O. Oldham
St. Louis

Ray Rodriguez
Kansas City

Stanley D. Rostov
Kansas City

Mabel Schulenberg
Independence

Ashton Stovall
Kansas City

Membership

NEBRASKA ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Michael Adams, *Chairperson*
Omaha

Eugene H. Freund
Omaha

John A. Gale
North Platte

Jan F. Gauger
Lincoln

Martha M. Gibbs
Omaha

Gary Hill
Lincoln

Dianne G. Myers
Lincoln

Vicki J. Krecek
Omaha

Louis LaRose
Winnebago

Garnet I. Larson
Lincoln

Shirley M. Marsh
Lincoln

Rita L. Melgares
Omaha

Lonnie B. Thomas
Omaha

Richard E. Shugrue
Omaha

Charles B. Washington
Omaha

Glossary

Equal Employment Opportunity: The absence of any barriers to the opportunity for minorities and women or other protected classes to obtain employment, promotions, or other benefits and opportunities available to workers.

Affirmative Action: Positive measures to remove existing discriminatory practices or eliminate the effects of past discriminatory practices.

State Labor Force: All those in the State working, seeking work, or who might seek work if jobs were available, if they could get the necessary training for jobs, etc.

Employed State Labor Force: All employed persons in the State.

State Work Force: All State government workers.

Agency Work Force: All employees of an individual State agency.

Underutilization: The use of minorities or women in a State or agency work force in smaller proportions than those that would be found if equal employment opportunity prevailed.

Validation: The determination that an examination procedure (formal or informal) does not discriminate unreasonably against minorities or women seeking employment.

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. By the terms of the act, as amended, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, sex, religion, or national origin, or in the administration of justice: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Advisory Committees of the Central States Region have received much-needed assistance from Professor Russell Getter, Department of Political Science, University of Kansas, who served as a consultant to the Commission. He computerized the large volume of data from the four States and the data from the interviews. He provided statistical advice and analysis that were invaluable in the preparation of this report.

The Advisory Committees thank the State governments of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska for their cooperation in furnishing basic statistical data and staff time to answer innumerable questions and to comment on drafts of this report.

Final production of the report was the responsibility of Deborah Harrison, Vivian Hauser, Rita Higgins, Audrey Holton, and Vivian Washington, supervised by Bobby Wortman, in the Commission's Publications Support Center, Office of Management.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
The Legal Basis of State Affirmative Action
Underutilization
Validation
Guidelines and Standards
Methodology
Data
Analysis of the Data
Perspectives on Affirmative Action in this Study
2. Affirmative Action: An Overview of the Four States 8
Agency Achievements
Agency Efforts
Summary
3. Affirmative Action in Iowa 13
The Setting
Iowa State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women
Affirmative Action Planning
Perceptions of Iowa Affirmative Action
The Role of Responsible State Agencies
Summary
4. Affirmative Action in Kansas 20
The Setting
Kansas State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women
Affirmative Action Planning
Perceptions of Kansas Affirmative Action
The Role of Responsible State Agencies
Summary
Chapter Appendix: State EEO Coordinator's Comments on Comparison of Kansas State Agencies' Affirmative Action Plans With Model Plan
5. Affirmative Action in Missouri 30
The Setting
Missouri State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women
Affirmative Action Planning
Perceptions of Missouri Affirmative Action
The Role of Responsible State Agencies
Summary
6. Affirmative Action in Nebraska 37
The Setting
Nebraska State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women
Affirmative Action Planning
Perceptions of Nebraska Affirmative Action
The Role of Responsible State Agencies
Summary

7. The Role of Federal Monitoring and Review Agencies 45
Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs (BIPP)
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)
Department of Labor
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Summary
8. Conclusions, Findings, and Recommendations 49
TABLES
2.1 Plan Quality, Interviewee Perceptions, and Agency Utilization 10
2.2 State Employees, by Race and Sex, Reporting Adequate Agency Affirmative Action Efforts 11
2.3 State Employees, by Rank and Responsibility, Reporting Adequate Agency Affirmative Action Efforts 12
3.1 Iowa Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class 14
3.2 Iowa Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities 18
3.3 Ratings of Iowa Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent 18
4.1 Kansas Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class 21
4.2 Kansas Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities 25
4.3 Ratings of Kansas Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent 25
5.1 Missouri Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class 31
5.2 Missouri Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities 33
5.3 Ratings of Missouri Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent 34
6.1 Nebraska Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class 39
6.2 Nebraska Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities 42
6.3 Ratings of Nebraska Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent
7.1 Affirmative Action Funding in Region VII, IPP, FY 1972--1976 47
CHARTS
3.1 Utilization of Minorities and Women by Iowa State Agencies 16
4.1 Utilization of Minorities and Women by Kansas State Agencies 22
5.1 Utilization of Minorities and Women by Missouri State Agencies 32
6.1 Utilization of Minorities and Women by Nebraska State Agencies 41
APPENDICES
A. Race and Sex Composition of State Agencies (by Occupational Class, by Salary Level, and Agencywide) 53
B. State and Agency Affirmative Action Plans Compared to a Model Plan 97

Preface

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recently reported, "In the year 1977, nothing is more central to the success of the long struggle to eliminate racial discrimination from American life than the effort to establish equal access to job and career opportunities."[1] The quest for equal employment opportunity is mandated in Federal law by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. Title VII forbids discrimination in State employment and Title VI requires nondiscrimination in federally-funded programs. Other mandates are provided by State laws, both statute and executive order. Federal regulations require that all federally-funded agencies have an effective affirmative action plan and processes to achieve equal opportunity.[2]

The Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council, a Federal group composed of representatives of the Attorney General of the United States, U.S. Secretary of Labor, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, has explained the role of affirmative action in the quest for equal employment opportunity:

> On the one hand, vigorous enforcement of the laws against discrimination is essential. But equally, and perhaps even more important are affirmative, voluntary efforts on the part of public employers to assure that positions in the public service are genuinely and equally accessible to qualified persons, without regard to their sex, racial or ethnic characteristics. The importance of voluntary affirmative action on the part of employers is underscored by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 11246, and related laws and regulations, all of which emphasize voluntary action to achieve equal employment opportunity.[3]

The Commission on Civil Rights adds that:

> The justification for affirmative action to secure equal access to the job market lies in the need to overcome the effects of past discrimination by the employers, unions, colleges, and universities who are asked to undertake such action. It rests also in the practical need to assure that young people whose lives have been marred by discrimination in public education and other institutions are not forever barred from the opportunity to realize their potential and to become useful and productive citizens. The test of affirmative action programs is whether they are well calculated to achieve these objectives and whether or not they do so in a way that deals fairly with the rights and interests of all citizens. While care must be taken to safeguard against abuses, we believe that affirmative action as applied in the variety of contexts examined in this statement, including those where numerically-based remedies have been employed, meets this fundamental standard.[4]

It is widely believed that an affirmative action program constitutes reverse discrimination, but this is not the case. Such programs merely neutralize the longstanding advantages inherent in belonging to some groups and the disadvantages that go along with membership in others. The Commission points out that affirmative action "programs are intended to provide opportunities that were denied to many applicants earlier in their lives and may be foreclosed forever if affirmative action is not permitted to intervene."[5]

Nor do these programs require hiring the unqualified. In fact employers will be offered a wider choice of talent if affirmative action replaces systems where in the past racial and sexist stereotypes operated to exclude women and minorities without even considering their actual qualifications.

Affirmative action does not require rigid quotas, but flexible goals and timetables that:

> can provide a means for simplifying the remedial process and easing the administrative burden of supervision that would otherwise rest on the government and employers. In many situations, an appropriate remedy for discrimination will permit a good deal of subjective judgment to enter into the hiring and promotion process. Safeguarding the rights of minorities would ordinarily require careful

checks upon the exercise of such judgment through detailed reporting and close supervision by top management and by government. Goals and timetables can ease that burden by serving as a valuable standard for determining whether the system is providing the relief envisaged.[6]

Civil Rights Commission Chairman Arthur Flemming has pointed out that "the moral and ethical imperatives of affirmative action need no further expansion...there has not, however, been the widespread spiritual acceptance of these imperatives that leads to meaningful and significant action."[7]

It is in this context that the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights have reviewed the States' affirmative action efforts. The four Committees shared a troubling perception—minorities and women are not being sufficiently employed by State governments. The Committees have collected data on the current employment patterns of all State agencies. They have interviewed a wide range of State employees in six agencies, as well as representatives of interested community groups and State legislators.

The status of the handicapped has been omitted from this study, as they are not included in the mandate of the Commission.

Notes to Preface

1. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Statement on Affirmative Action* (October 1977), p. 1.

2. See, U.S., Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, revised orders 4 and 14; and Executive order 11246. See also, Commercial Clearinghouse, *Employment Practices Guide*, para. 1332.

3. 41 Fed. Reg. 38,815 (1976).

4. *Statement on Affirmative Action*, p. 12.

5. Ibid., p. 11.

6. Ibid., p. 7.

7. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Making Public Employment a Model for Equal Employment Opportunity* (report of proceedings of Regional Civil Rights Conference II, Boston, Mass., Sept. 22–24, 1974), p. 11.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Affirmative action programs are mandated by both State and Federal laws as means to achieve equal employment opportunity. At a given place of employment, the extent of affirmative action efforts will depend on the extent to which equality of opportunity has not been realized, which in turn is measured by the degrees of minority and female "underutilization." Underutilization analysis requires extensive work force and labor force data.

Should underutilization be found, an employer's entire personnel system must be reviewed. A key element of such a review is the "validation" of tests used for job placement. The standards for this have been outlined by various Federal agencies, which have also developed model affirmative action plans.

The four Advisory Committees have gathered and analysed work force and labor force data, reviewed agency affirmative action plans and programs, and interviewed numerous agency employees and officials in their effort to discover the quality and effectiveness of affirmative action activities in the four States.

The Legal Basis of State Affirmative Action

The law has required affirmative action efforts by State governments since 1971. In that year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Defense stated in the "Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration" for their grant programs that:

> Equal employment opportunity will be assured in the State system and affirmative action provided in its administration. Discrimination against any person in recruitment, examination, appointment, training, promotion, retention, discipline or any other aspect of personnel administration because of political or religious opinions or affiliations or because of race, national origin, or other nonmerit factors will be prohibited. Discrimination on the basis of age or sex or physical disability will be prohibited except where specific age, sex, or physical requirements constitute a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to proper and efficient administration. The regulations will include provisions for appeals in cases of alleged discrimination to an impartial body whose determination shall be binding upon a finding of discrimination.[1]

Affirmative action should also alleviate the perpetuated effects of a government agency's testing and educational requirements if these requirements have been discriminatory.[2]

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1971 placed a duty on the U.S. Civil Service Commission to ensure enforcement of a variety of Federal standards, including affirmative action, for the 27 programs included by statute.[3]

In addition, in the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, which amended Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the exemption granted State and local government civil servants was withdrawn.[4] Thus the entire weight of civil rights requirements is now imposed on State government employment practices.

It is also well settled that among the courts' judicial powers and duties is the broad power to require affirmative action of an employer to correct the continuing effects of that employer's past discrimination in violation of Title VII.[5] State governments in this region have not, to date, been found by courts to be subject to judicially imposed remedy. In the main, this is because they themselves have undertaken efforts to correct past deficiencies. It is the extent and success of these efforts that the State Advisory Committees sought to explore.

Underutilization

Underutilization analysis is at first glance very simple. The lawyers' rule of thumb is that a group's share of an employer's work force should correspond to its share of the labor force from which the work force is recruited. However, problems arise in defining the area of recruitment geographically and in matching the workers' jobs

to federally-defined categories for comparison to labor force statistics.

The lawyers' rule requires that the appropriate labor force area's geography be identified. The geographic boundary for a private employer's recruitment effort is an SMSA or similar narrowly defined geographical area. However, for a State government the appropriate recruitment area is less clear. Some personnel officers have argued that the appropriate area is the SMSA around the State's capital city, but in practice State governments recruit statewide. The Advisory Committees therefore have concluded that the entire State is the appropriate boundary for the labor force data to which State government work force data must be compared. (The Advisory Committees concur with Commerce Clearinghouse that for States, as in private industry, national labor force data must be considered for technical, professional, and highly skilled jobs for which workers are recruited nationally.[6])

Defining the labor force geographically is not the only problem in underutilization analysis. Published labor force statistics do not provide complete data on either the labor force or all the occupations found in State government.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs has listed the eight factors which must be calculated for every occupation as part of any analysis of the labor force:

> minority and female populations of the recruitment area; the size of minority and female unemployment in the area; the percentages of the minority and employed female labor forces as compared with the total employed labor force in the area; the general availability of minorities and females having requisite skills in an area in which the State government can reasonably recruit; the actual availability of minorities and women having requisite skills in the normal recruitment area; the availability of promotable minorities and females within the organization; existence of promotable minorities and females within the organization; existence of training institutions capable of training persons in the requisite skills; the degree of training which the State government can reasonably undertake as a means of making all job types available to minorities and women.[7]

These calculations must be made for every occupation because supply and demand vary for workers with different skills. For private employers whose employees work in a small range of activities, estimates of comparable categories of workers in the labor force can be calculated. But State government typically requires the services of hundreds of different types of workers, complicating job category by job category comparison to the labor force.

For private employers, consultants such as National Planning Data Corporation have produced estimates of these eight factors, relying on census data and formula adjustments.[8] However, such estimates and estimators have not been available to State governments owing to the State practice of doing such work in house. Because such in-house efforts have had to make do without adequate resources and staff, State governments are left without the complete information needed for effective affirmative action planning. Yet there is no doubt that a committed State government could muster the resources needed to gather the types of information listed above.

This lack of information limited the analysis of the Advisory Committees. The Advisory Committees were not able to perform a complete underutilization analysis incorporating the eight factors of availability and trainability suggested by the General Services Administration. However, the Advisory Committees concluded that at least in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska, the labor force's characteristics are approximated reasonably well in the *employed* State labor force. The Committees therefore chose the employed State labor force as a surrogate for the eight-factor labor force measures and accepted the employed State labor force as the standard against which to assess overall State government affirmative action performance. (However, in a State where the employed labor force did not approximate the labor force, the use of the surrogate would not be justified and the more rigorous eight-factor analysis would be necessary.)

The Advisory Committees also found that in each of the four States, minority and female utilization in State government as a whole appeared to equal or exceed their utilization in the employed State labor force, and similar patterns exist in some job categories.[9] This was interpreted as evidence of adequate utilization in the State government work force, which left the Advisory

Committees with the task of finding a standard for analysis of utilization of minorities and women at the agency level.

The prototype for analyzing agency performances is a procedure used by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) in dealing with private industry. OFCCP measures facility work force utilization by job category, then compares that to within-facility *departmental* work force utilization by job category. Undue concentration or underutilization is considered to exist if in any job category the departmental work force's minority or female proportion is less than 0.8 or greater than 1.2 of the minority or female proportion in the facility work force. We believe it reasonable to regard State government as analogous to the facility, and State agencies as analogous to the facility's departments.

In short, the Advisory Committees, lacking complete State labor force data, have compared the proportions of minorities and women by job category in each State agency work force to those of the State work force. This rule is applicable to the four States because their State work forces do replicate the employed State labor force, which in turn implicitly reflects some of the remaining availability factors.

If underutilization is determined, what shall be the remedy? The simplistic and bureaucratic answer is to redistribute persons from agencies with more than sufficient utilization to those which are underutilized. But we know from the available data that there are at least some additional qualified persons, currently unemployed, available for State government. In addition, our surrogate measure probably understates the numbers of persons who are discouraged jobseekers, skilled but not in the employed labor force, promotable, etc. Given the availability of these persons, the Advisory Committees believe it is appropriate to suggest that, rather than reshuffle, individual agencies should hire additional persons so that their work force composition approaches that of the State.

For some State agencies, or for some jobs in State agencies, the skills required are so specialized that not even recruiting in the national labor force would provide minorities and women. For others, although the State labor force itself does not include suitable candidates, recruitment through the Nation would produce them. While a perfect match in each agency is highly improbable, progress toward that goal is to be expected in most.

Validation

Tests, whether they be formal written examinations or skills-testing procedures or merely one or more interviews, must, by law, have some reasonable relationship to the job that is to be filled. This is called validity, and the debate on how to determine validity is still in progress.

Examination of validity is essentially an effort to determine whether any testing procedure accurately predicts job performance. Grace Wright has pointed out that "in a true merit system all tests must be valid. Invalid tests represent a fundamental violation of merit system principles."[10] Such a violation occurs, for example, when an applicant's test score (and job eligibility) is lowered as a result of poor performances on test sections that have no relation to performance in the job sought. It might be added that failure to validate is also a poor business practice, for it unnecessarily limits the potential sources of recruits and is likely to result in a higher turnover rate due to unsatisfactory performance by some of those hired.

A "content validity" study measures the correlations of skills, aptitudes, knowledge, and personality tested in a given examination with the skills, aptitudes, knowledge, and personality traits required for the job. This procedure, Grace Wright asserts, "is most appropriate for a situation in which what is to be measured is extremely clear and has a straightforward, logical relation to the job to be done."[11] But as the guidelines of the Departments of Labor and Justice and of the Civil Service Commission point out, "content validity by itself is not an appropriate validation strategy for intelligence, aptitude, personality, or interest tests."[12] Despite this awareness, these agencies have agreed to accept content validation.

"Criteria validation" procedures attempt to correlate performance on a given examination with performance on the job, either by testing first and measuring success later or by testing persons already on the job and comparing test results to predetermined criteria for successful performance. By comparing the hiring test performances of, for example, a group of minority employees with their subsequent work performances, an employer can

learn whether the test persistently underestimates the work potential of members of the minority group. If it does, it has probably served to exclude other members of the group on account of some minority-associated factor that shows up on the test but not later on the job. Such an exclusion is discrimination.

The Departments of Labor and Justice do not favor validation procedures that explicitly determine the racial impact of tests and the test process. On the other hand, EEOC and the Civil Rights Commission prefer criteria validation precisely because it does take account of the racial impact of testing.[13]

For either of these tests of validity, a complete job analysis is essential. Otherwise, the content of a job or the criteria used to evaluate persons in a job cannot be validated. A job analysis asks what, where, how, when, and why the worker does whatever he or she does and what demands are placed on the worker.[14] Under the Iowa and similar systems, the analysis involves determination by a review panel—including jobholders, their supervisors, and personnel specialists—of the tasks required on a given job and the skills, knowledge, aptitudes, and personal characteristics required to perform these tasks.[15] These steps are common to both content and criteria validation.

But in criteria validation the next step is to determine appropriate criteria. These must satisfy the tests of relevance, reliability, freedom from bias, effective range of response, availability and practicality, and acceptability to management. These are then tested using the different population subgroups in the labor pool—women, men, minorities, etc.—to determine whether the pre-employment test indeed successfully predicts high performance on the criteria specified at a statistically significant level of at least .05. If the correlation exists across all groups, then the test is considered valid.

In a content validation procedure, the reviewer, having performed job analysis, merely ensures that the skills tested are indeed the skills required for the job.

Relying on a series of cases culminating in *Washington v. Davis*,[16] State agencies in the Central States Region have depended on content validation as their principal means of ensuring that unfair racial, sex, or age discrimination in the testing process is minimized.

The preference for content over criteria validity procedures in the States reflects the statistical difficulties involved in criteria validity. These difficulties arise principally from the lack of sufficient minorities or women in many of the smaller job categories to sustain reliable statistical operations. But content validation does not require that minorities be included in the sample, nor does it require a specific sample size or the rigorous statistical testing required in criteria validation. State personnel officers believe that whereas criteria validity tests are difficult to use because their rigorous bases provide grounds for findings of invalidity by EEOC or the courts, content validity tests are, *prima facie*, likely to be successful proof of validity. This belief has led State personnel agencies to opt for content validation as the preferred technique for meeting affirmative action selection procedure requirements of the Federal statutes, orders, regulations, and guidelines.[17]

However, all four States participate in the MIKN Selection Information Exchange, which develops and validates tests for use by members. Given the widespread use of professionally prepared and nationally (or at least regionally) validated examinations, it would not seem difficult to develop criteria validated tests in the Central States Region similar to the formats for content validation developed by Iowa but now used throughout the region. Such a method is specifically authorized by the Employee Selection Guidelines and could be funded under an Intergovernmental Personnel Act grant.[18]

Guidelines and Standards

The State Advisory Committees have reviewed the literature on affirmative action in the public sector in search of adequate treatments of the concepts and issues in the field. With the notable exception of Grace Wright's *Public Sector Employment Selection* and similar International Personnel Management Association (IPMA) studies, the Advisory Committees are struck by the absence of significant discussions of affirmative action goals and methods in the public administration literature. Particularly striking is the virtual absence of such discussions in the standard public administration textbooks. It is not surprising that so many administrators claim ignorance of affirmative action—it is evidently not considered part of the main curriculum of public administration.

The technical literature is also rather limited. Other than the Wright study, a two-volume manual prepared by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for employers generally, some publications of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the Commerce Clearinghouse and Prentice Hall manuals, there is really very little to assist the serious State compliance officer in devising and implementing an effective affirmative action program. While many private firms exist to provide compliance assistance for private industry, in government the practice of working in-house and the high costs of private affirmative action consultants have generally imposed the burden directly on civil servants. However, the Civil Service Commission does provide advice, consultation, and direct assistance on equal employment opportunity and related issues on both a reimbursable and nonreimbursable basis.

While the Advisory Committees recognize the obstacles confronting affirmative action efforts, they are convinced that the weight of both morality and law require that States lead the way in developing effective affirmative action programs, serve as models in the implementation of affirmative action goals and strategies, and lead to genuine equal employment opportunity.

The guidelines used by the Advisory Committees in this review are those proposed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council, composed of representatives of the Attorney General of the United States, U.S. Secretary of Labor, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The Coordinating Council is charged, under the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, with responsibility for

> ...developing and implementing agreements and policies designed, among other things, to eliminate conflict and inconsistency among the agencies of the Federal Government responsible for administering Federal law prohibiting discrimination...[19]

The Council's guidelines reflect what State and local governments may be expected to do. The guidelines urge:

- Analysis of work force to determine underutilization.
- If underutilization is found, a comprehensive review of the selection process to determine the elements which operate to exclude, including: recruitment, testing, ranking, certification, interview, recommendations for selection, hiring, promotion, etc. "The examination of each element of the selection process should at a minimum include a determination of its validity in predicting job performance."
- "Where an employer has reason to believe that its selection procedures have the exclusionary effect described...above, it should initiate affirmative steps to remedy the situation."

Such steps include:

- Establishment of long term and short term goals and timetables for the specific job classifications, taking into account the existing labor market.
- A recruitment program designed to attract qualified members of the group or groups discriminated against.
- A systematic effort to organize work to provide opportunities for persons lacking "journeyman" level knowledge or skills and a career ladder for upward mobility.
- Revamping selection instruments or procedures which have not been validated to eliminate exclusionary elements.
- Measures designed to assure that members of the affected groups who are qualified are included in the pool from which selection will be made.
- Systematic effort to provide career advancement.
- Regular monitoring and evaluation so as to allow appropriate changes in the plans as needed.[20]

The Advisory Committees believe that these standards are reasonable and that both States as employers and Federal agencies as monitors should reasonably expect their implementation.

Methodology

The Advisory Committees sought to obtain the EEO–4 data (employees sorted by race-gender group, salary, and job category) for each State agency in the four States; State labor force statistics to use as a basis of comparison; interviews with a selection of State officials, State employees, and community leaders with knowledge of State employment practices; and copies of agency and governmentwide affirmative action plans for comparison to ideal plans.

Data

The four State Advisory Committees obtained data on State employees from the personnel officers of each State. This was in the form of copies of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's Form EEO–4 that divides State and local government workers by salary, race, and sex. At the request of the Advisory Committees, States furnished this information for each of the principal State agencies, aggregating smaller agencies of fewer than 15 employees in a single category. Kansas submitted somewhat different data, which were recoded into the EEO–4 format.

A computer was used to facilitate analysis. Data were recoded to permit cross-tabulation of the eight EEOC job categories (administrators, professionals, technicians, protective service, paraprofessionals, office/clerical, skilled workers, and maintenance), three salary categories (incomes less than $8,000 per year, $8–$16,000 per year, and greater than $16,000 per year), and four race-gender categories (white males, minority males, white females, and minority females). These recoded data have been incorporated into this report as appendix A, which includes corrections made after verification by the States.

Additionally, in each of the four States in the region, six agencies were selected for a comprehensive analysis of their actual affirmative action plans and programs. Three were chosen because their functions are significant to women and minorities and because they utilize large amounts of Federal funds, either directly or by pass-through. These three were the department of education, department of social services, and the job service components of the State labor-employment security agencies.

For each State, numbers were then assigned to the remaining agencies, which were grouped by size of the agency work force. Use of a formal random selection procedure ensured that the final three agencies chosen would include one larger agency (over 100 employees), one medium-sized agency (50–99), and one smaller agency (under 50).

Once chosen, each agency was informed of its selection. The agency was asked to arrange appointments for members of the Advisory Committee staff with the chief executive, the personnel officer, the person in charge of the affirmative action program, one minority member and one woman in a professional or administrative capacity, and one minority member and one woman in a clerical or similarly ranked category. In some cases fewer interviews were actually held because the agency could not furnish the categories of employees requested. In most agencies persons interviewed appeared to have been picked nearly at random (in many cases only one or two persons fit a particular category; if one was out of the office the day we interviewed, the other was interviewed). In short, there is no reason to believe that random selection from a list of all possible subjects provided by the agencies would have resulted in a less biased sample.

The number of persons interviewed varied slightly from State to State. In Iowa, 36 persons responded; in Kansas, 39; in Missouri, 37; and in Nebraska, 40. While the sample size is small (compared to the abstract notion of all statistically based samples), there is no reason to believe that the sample is not representative of all State employees.

To facilitate processing the data, interviewers used a precoded response sheet on which they indicated whether the respondent believed a given aspect of the affirmative action effort actually existed and whether the respondent considered it inadequate or adequate. A scale of 1 to 4 denoted inadequate to adequate effort, as perceived by the respondent. The response sheet also provided for the possibility that the respondent did not know about the topic considered. Where topics were plainly inappropriate, or time limited, questions were omitted.

In addition to the interviews, each agency was asked to supply a copy of its most recent affirmative action plan and any relevant supporting documents. The Advisory Committees' research design for studying adequacy of affirmative action plans is explained more fully in the next section. In brief, however, the study design was formulated primarily on the basis of affirmative action criteria developed in the U.S. Civil Service Commission's *A Guide for Affirmative Action*[21] and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's *Affirmative Action and Equal Employment*.[22]

Analysis of the Data

Preliminary analysis revealed a marked difference across agencies and across States in completeness and validity of the employment data. As a result, some of the analyses could not be performed in as scientifically rigorous a manner as might be desirable in the abstract. However, where appropriate, quantitative analyses were conducted.

The statistical techniques employed in the study were Chi-Square (for tests of statistical significance) and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (for measuring the degree of association between two sets of numbers). However, because many of the data used in the study did not lend themselves to precise quantitative evaluation, these tests of statistical significance and measures of association could only be used judgmentally and where appropriate. For this reason, Chi-Square and/or Pearson's Product Moment Correlations are not reported in all instances, since such statistical measures may be misleading where they are inappropriately used or interpreted.

Perspectives on Affirmative Action in this Study

The Advisory Committees have attempted to address a complex problem. To do so they started with some simple hypotheses that might be confirmed or rejected by the data available. If conditions of equal employment opportunity existed:

- All States and agencies would utilize minorities and women sufficiently.

And, where underutilization signalled a lack of equal employment opportunity:

- Affirmative action plans would be complete, including the full set of components listed in model plans.
- Affirmative action programs would be fully implemented.
- Affirmative action efforts would be perceived to be effective by staff, irrespective of their race, sex, or job level.

Although in the real world these conditions will never be uniformly prevalent, the Advisory Committees believe that the extent of the discrepancy between these hypotheses and reality is a good measure of State affirmative action.

In chapter 2 of this study, an overview of the agencies' performances and efforts is given. Chapters 3 through 6 show the status of affirmative action by State. In chapter 7 the State Advisory Committees review the role of Federal agencies that can compel action. Chapter 8 contains the Advisory Committees' conclusions, findings, and recommendations.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of Labor; Department of Defense, "Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration" (Mar. 6, 1971).

2. U.S., Civil Service Commission, *A Guide for Affirmative Action* (1972).

3. U.S., Civil Service Commission, *Merit Systems Standards Guide for Review of Personnel Provisions of State Plans* (March 1972).

4. 42 U.S.C. §2000 E(a), as amended (1972).

5. Alexander v. Gardner-Denver, Co., 94 S.Ct. 1011 (1974).

6. Commerce Clearinghouse, *Employment Practices*, para. 1605.

7. Adapted from U.S., General Services Administration, *Contract Compliance Handbook* (Apr. 12, 1977), p. 12.

8. Control Data Corporation, *Affirmative Action Program for Magnetic Media Division* (Omaha: Control Data Corp., 1977), pp. 80ff.

9. Job category data are on file at the Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in Kansas City, Mo.

10. Grace H. Wright, *Public Sector Employment Selection* (Chicago: IPMA, 1974), p. 125.

11. Ibid., p. 130.

12. 42 Fed. Reg. 3,823 (1977).

13. Ibid.

14. State of Iowa, Merit Employment Department, *Job Analysis Guidelines* (July 1974), p. 1.

15. Ibid., chaps. 2, 3, 4, 5

16. Washington v. Davis, 11 EPD para. 10,958 (1976).

17. Staff notes of interviews with State personnel officers on file in Central States Regional Office.

18. U.S., Civil Service Commission, *EEO for State and Local Governments*, no. 3 (n.d.)

19. 41 Fed. Reg. 3,881 (1976).

20. Ibid.

21. U.S., Civil Service Commission, *A Guide for Affirmative Action* (1972).

22. U.S., Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *Affirmative Action and Equal Employment* (January 1974).

Chapter 2

Affirmative Action: An Overview of the Four States

Agency Achievements

The extent of underutilization becomes evident when one examines not the performance of State government as a whole but the performance of individual State agencies. The Advisory Committees examined agency utilization of minorities and women in three areas of employment: senior level jobs (administrative, professional, and technical), top salaries (greater than $16,000 per year), and total agency work force. Agency utilization in one of these categories is considered adequate when the minority and female proportions in that category at the agency match or exceed such proportions in the State government work force. A match exists if the agency proportion is at least 80 percent of the State government proportion.

The proportion of agency work forces that match or exceed State work force utilization is very small, with a few exceptions such as utilization of white females in top jobs in Missouri. On the whole, less than a third of State agencies match the efforts of their States in the three categories analyzed.

An analysis of the affirmative action achievements of the four States' agencies responsible for education, administration, employment services, highways, police, and social services discloses no pattern.[1] No State exhibits consistent success or consistent failure, and neither does any particular functional type of agency perform uniformly from State to State. Neither State nor function of agency reliably predicts a match between State and agency utilization of minorities and women. It is clear that these agencies, all recipients of Federal funds, are not responding consistently to the Federal demand for equal employment opportunity.

Agency Efforts

However important accomplishments are to affirmative action, effort must also be recognized. Many State agencies contend that, while they have not done well, they are doing all they can to recruit, retain, and promote minorities and women at all levels. They argue that although their strategies have not yet paid off, results will follow.

The Advisory Committees settled on two measures of effort: (1) the quality of the actual affirmative action plans as compared to a model plan devised by the Committees; and (2) the perceptions by persons interviewed by the Advisory Committees that the plans and efforts exist and work. While the details of these efforts are described in chapters 3 through 6, here an overview suggests some patterns to watch.[2]

Table 2.1 shows the Advisory Committees' ratings of plans at 24 agencies, the mean ranking of effort by State employees of their agencies' affirmative action efforts, and the proportions of minorities and women employed. The most immediate point of interest is the lack of correlation between these three elements.

Agencies did very poorly in the scores of their plans as rated by the Advisory Committees. Out of a maximum of 19 possible points by which plans might be evaluated, only one agency got more than 10. Most got fewer than 5 of the possible points. By comparison with private affirmative action plans reviewed by the Advisory Committees' staff, all of the State agencies' plans were very weak. Supportive detail and clear analysis were missing. The principal elements for a thorough plan were absent from many. Agencies within a single State government varied widely in their scores, as did agencies in different States but with comparable functions. Apparently neither central authority nor agency mission evokes uniform responses when it comes to affirmative action.

No agency got a perfect (4) staff perception score—that is, no agency got unanimous acknowledgment from staff interviewed that there was a good plan that was being implemented successfully. In each of the four States the three agencies which received substantial Federal funding do appear to have produced somewhat better plans and programs than the three randomly selected

agencies. But the difference is hardly dramatic. (It should be noted that a disproportionate number of interviewees were officials and executives, who generally were white males. Thus, the white male point of view may have had a disproportionate effect on the scores in table 2.1.)

There are substantially different perceptions, based on race and sex, of the degree of agency accomplishment. These are summarized in table 2.2. With some exceptions, white males were generally far more likely to perceive success on the key points about which they were questioned than were persons from other groups. But it is clear that there is no uniform agreement within any of the States that State government has carried out its affirmative action obligation. (For all but one of the key questions the regionwide differences among race and sex groups are statistically significant.) Some statistically significant differences are also indicated within individual States. But the table speaks for itself in showing the extent of disparity of perceptions. That minority members and women do not perceive the effectiveness or even the existence of agency effort is itself a sign that affirmative action has not been given significant priority by top management.

At no agency studied did interviewees report substantial community input into affirmative action planning and implementation. Few interviewees even reported large numbers of their own staffs involved. Most agencies apparently rely on executive staff for affirmative action planning.

The pattern of perceptions within the four States also reveals interesting disparities among job categories. Table 2.3 shows that, by and large, the agency chief and the personnel officer are most pleased with progress. Occasionally they are joined by the most junior employees. Senior staff are most likely to find their agency's efforts unsatisfactory. Affirmative action officers give their performance ratings somewhere between the most positive and the most negative, varying widely. (The same prevalence of the white male view found in table 2.1 is even more influential in table 2.3.)

There is no correlation between State and perception of performance. State officials rate their efforts well in some areas, badly in others, so that a State which is well regarded by its staff in one area may be poorly regarded in another.

Summary

It is clear that agencies' affirmative action efforts are not uniformly regarded as complete. There are significant differences in the degree of adequacy perceived by the various race-sex groups and job roles. The absence of a clear pattern shows that no one State has done clearly better than another. These discrepancies, together with the low scores on the plans, show that much remains to be done if affirmative action efforts are to have any meaning in terms of actual improvements in equality of opportunity.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. The four States' education, employment, and social services agencies are described in detail in chapters 3 to 6 and in appendix B. For the administration, highways, and police agencies, complete profiles have not been included in this report but are on file at the Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Kansas City, Mo.

2. The Missouri Department of Social Services comments:

> The report reflects difficulties in measuring effort. I recognize the inherent difficulty involved, but am recommending the devotion of some energy to developing such a measure. This would be especially helpful in future reports, particularly since State agencies would be able to use these results in planning initial or additional recruitment and retention efforts.

Source: Sherrell A. Hunt, Director of Personnel, Missouri Department of Social Services, letter to staff, Aug. 26, 1977.

The Advisory Committees concur in this view. They hope that the various governmental and nongovernmental bodies concerned with affirmative action will be able to devote some time to this problem.

TABLE 2.1
Plan Quality, Interviewee Perceptions, and Agency Utilization

Agency	Iowa	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska	Average
EDUCATION					
Plan Score	4	2	5	2	3
Average Perception Rating	3.6	3.0	3.2	2.9	3.2
Minority share of agency work force (%)	2.52	3.33	9.79	2.80	NA
Female share of agency work force (%)	51.30	58.00	66.85	58.60	NA
SOCIAL SERVICES					
Plan	7	2	4	3	4
Perception	2.9	3.4	3.1	2.6	3.0
Minority	2.28	8.99	14.52	3.94	NA
Female	64.05	71.25	66.84	63.44	NA
EMPLOYMENT SERVICES					
Plan	3	4	10	3	5
Perception	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.7
Minority	4.52	11.09	16.76	12.24	NA
Female	54.36	50.73	57.47	46.86	NA
RANDOM (3 agencies)					
Plan	1(2)*	1(2)*	1(2)*	1(1)*	1(2)*
Perception	2.7	2.6	2.9	2.5	2.7
Minority	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE					
Plan	4	2	5	2	3.0
Perceptions	3.2	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.1
Minority	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Plan Score: Plan presented by agency compared to model plan, ranked by Advisory Committees with maximum possible score of 19.

Average Perception Rating: Maximum possible score is 4, with 1 inadequate and 4 adequate.

NA: Data required inappropriate aggregation.

*Number of agencies (of 3 examined) that had plans is shown in parentheses.

Source: Interview data are on file in the Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Agency work force and plan information are in the appendices.

TABLE 2.2

State Employees, by Race and Sex, Reporting Adequate Agency Affirmative Action Efforts

Agency Affirmative Action Activity	Minority Males (%)	Minority Females (%)	White Males (%)	White Females (%)
HEAD AFFIRMED COMMITMENT TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION				
TOTAL*	27.3	62.5	46.8	36.2
Iowa	0	100	62.5	87.5
Kansas*	0	11.1	44.4	44.4
Missouri	50	100	90	55.6
Nebraska	25	0	50	16.7
WORK FORCE ANALYZED FOR UNDERUTILIZATION				
TOTAL*	12.5	42.9	61.3	47.4
Iowa	0	0	33.3	60
Kansas	0	66.7	66.7	40
Missouri	0	50	84.6	40
Nebraska	33.3	0	33.3	50
STAFF INVOLVED IN PLANNING				
TOTAL*	12.5	25.0	54.3	37.1
Iowa	0	0	55.6	50
Kansas	0	50	40	80
Missouri	33.3	50	76.9	50
Nebraska	0	0	33.3	50
ACTION TAKEN TO RECRUIT SENIOR LEVEL MINORITIES AND WOMEN				
TOTAL*	10	41.7	66.7	42.9
Iowa	0	0	60	50
Kansas	0	66.7	66.7	20.0
Missouri*	0	40	100	42.9
Nebraska	25	33.3	0	50
WOMEN AND MINORITIES PROMOTED TO SENIOR POSTS				
TOTAL*	23.1	31.3	70.3	62.8
Iowa	0	33.3	90	83.3
Kansas	0	33.3	60	62.5
Missouri*	0	16.7	57.1	33.3
Nebraska	60	50	75	72.7

*Chi-Square significant at alpha less than 0.1

TABLE 2.3

State Employees, by Rank and Responsibility, Reporting Adequate Agency Affirmative Action Efforts

Agency Affirmative Action Activity	Agency Chief (%)	Personnel (%)	EEO (%)	Senior (%)	Junior (%)
AGENCY CHIEF REAFFIRMED COMMITMENT TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN PAST YEAR					
Iowa	50	100	50	83.3	75
Kansas	80	100	0	50	50
Missouri	75	100	100	70	25
Nebraska	60	0	50	0	28.6
PRESENT WORK FORCE HAS BEEN ANALYZED					
Iowa	0	50	0	60	50
Kansas	40	75	100	20	66.7
Missouri	80	80	75	42.9	0
Nebraska	50	20	50	25	0
SPECIFIC MEASURABLE AND ATTAINABLE GOALS HAVE BEEN SET					
Iowa	50	75	0	40	0
Kansas	40	50	100	0	0
Missouri	50	20	25	25	0
Nebraska	33.3	25	50	0	0
INVOLVEMENT OF STAFF IN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANNING					
Iowa	75	50	33.3	40	0
Kansas	60	33.3	0	60	0
Missouri	83.3	75	50	55.6	0
Nebraska	50	20	100	16.7	25
MINORITY COMMUNITY RESOURCES HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED TO ASSIST RECRUITING					
Iowa	100	50	33.3	33.3	50
Kansas	66.7	0	100	0	50
Missouri	50	60	66.7	57.1	33.3
Nebraska	33.3	33.3	0	0	0
POSITIVE ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN TO RECRUIT MINORITIES AND WOMEN FOR SENIOR LEVEL JOBS					
Iowa	60	33.3	66.7	37.5	100
Kansas	40	50	100	40	0
Missouri	100	100	75	33.3	40
Nebraska	0	0	50	40	30
WOMEN AND MINORITIES HAVE BEEN PROMOTED TO SENIOR POSTS					
Iowa	25	100	100	37.5	83.3
Kansas	25	50	100	20	57.1
Missouri	66.7	40	50	27.3	20
Nebraska	80	80	100	70	60

Source: Data from interviews on file in Central States Regional Office.

Chapter 3

Affirmative Action in Iowa

The Setting

Iowa ranks 25th in the Nation in population, with 2,884,000 residents in 1972. Its capital, Des Moines, is the largest metropolitan area in the State, with a population of 201,404. The other large city, on the eastern side of the State, is Davenport. The State's population is 1.1 percent black, 0.8 percent Hispanic, and 0.1 percent Native American.[1]

Iowa's State government is a significant employer. Roughly 3.9 percent of the employed State labor force is employed by the State. As of 1973, 43,491 persons in 65 State agencies were on the payroll, 26,325 of whom were covered by the two State merit systems and 4,482 of whom were employed by the 11 grant-in-aid agencies covered by Federal merit procedures mandated by the Federal Intergovernmental Personnel Act. Size alone makes State government important in determining the extent of equal opportunity in the State.

The affirmative action efforts of State government are mandated by both Federal and State law. The Iowa Civil Rights Act of 1965, as amended (chap. 66, 71 section 105A1; chap. 73, section 601A1) forbids discrimination in employment (section 601A.6). This has been implemented for State agencies by Executive Order 15, issued by Governor Robert Ray on April 2, 1973. This order requires each agency to develop an affirmative action program and to report progress on its program to the Iowa Civil Rights Commission.

Iowa State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women

Governmentwide

Table 3.1 shows the race and sex composition of Iowa's State work force, both overall and by occupational group. This work force is similar in overall race and sex composition to the employed State labor force, for which overall race and sex proportions are also given in the table. Following the reasoning in the "Underutilization" section of chapter 1, the State work force can be accepted in this case as the standard against which to evaluate the individual agencies' affirmative action efforts.

By Agency

Chart 3.1 describes the performances of individual agencies in relation to the governmentwide performance. (The underlying data for this chart are in appendix A.) The chart shows whether an agency's work force "matches" the State work force's utilization of minority males, minority females, and white females. For each group, this utilization analysis has been made agencywide, in top jobs, and at the highest salary level, giving a total of nine criteria indicating the extent of equal employment opportunity.

Minority and female employment at individual State agencies varies widely from the State work force norms. Of the 49 larger agencies, not one matches the State work force in all nine criteria. Only 10 are adequate in five or more criteria. Eleven agencies fail to meet the State norm in any criterion.

The agencies most successful in matching State work force utilization of minorities and women are employment security, public instruction, planning and programming, and social services. In aggregate, the minor agencies (those with 15 or fewer employees) have also done well. Agencies that have not matched the State work force in any category are: banking, conservation, development commission, environmental quality board, geological survey, natural resources, pharmacy examiners, employee relations, public safety, transporatation, and watchmaking examiners.

For the agency work force as a whole, only seven agencies match the State work force utilization of all three race and sex groups of employees. Those are the aging commission, employment security commission, the Governor's staff, the historical society, the library commission, and the departments of public instruction and social ser-

TABLE 3.1
Iowa Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class

IOWA GOVERNMENT WORK FORCE*

Occupational Class	White Male (%)	White Female (%)	Minority Male (%)	Minority Female (%)
Professional, Technical & Paraprofessional	29.31	20.57	.69	.51
Administrator	3.39	.55	.08	.01
Clerical	3.39	17.25	.11	.49
Crafts	5.56	.79	.02	.04
Maintenance	8.94	2.15	.24	.10
Protective Service	5.50	.22	.10	.01
All Occupations	56.09	41.52	1.23	1.16
Number of Employees	10,353	7,665	227	214
IOWA EMPLOYED STATE LABOR FORCE**				
All Occupations	63.23	35.56	1.04	.70

*Percentages are of the entire work force.
**Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census, PC(1) C17, table 54

vices. Twenty-five of the 49 large agencies match the State work force utilization of white females, 21 for minority females, and 21 for minority males.

At the top salary level, no State agency matches both the State work force share for women and that for minorities. Only the attorney general's office and the departments of public instruction and social services match the State work force in as many as two of the three race and sex groups. Only 11 of the 49 agencies match for white females and only 6 for minority males. The number of minority females at this salary in State government is so small that the concept of agency matches is inapplicable.

Of the 49 agencies, only the employment security commission, the planning and programming staff, and the department of public instruction work forces match State work force utilization of minorities and women in top jobs. In addition to the 11 agencies which are already listed as not matching the State work force in any category, 12 other agencies fail to meet any of the three top job criteria. The remaining agencies' work forces match the State work force in one or two of the three race and sex categories. Fifteen of the 49 large agencies match for white females and 16 for minority males. For minority females, only 9 agencies match.

In short, utilization analysis of Iowa's State government shows agencies do underutilize by comparison with their own State work force. Only in a handful of agencies is utilization anything near what it should be. In a large number of agencies there is little or no utilization of minorities and women at more than the most minimal levels.

As discussed in the "Underutilization" section of chapter 1, the best remedy for imbalances among State agencies is not shuffling minorities and women from agency to agency, but additional hiring. Given the availability of Federal funding under programs of the U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce, such recruitment appears feasible.

A further justification for hiring more minorities and women is found in statistics on joblessness. The disparity in unemployment rates between whites (5.4 percent) and others (as high as 12.2 percent for blacks) is sufficiently large to suggest that minorities seeking work face greater difficulties than their white counterparts.[2] Iowa's job service reports that significant numbers of unemployed minorities and women are qualified for State employment. For example, among those fully qualified and available for professional, technical, and kindred jobs, 51.9 percent were female (2,059) and 6.3 percent (248) were minority members. Of those qualified and available for managerial posts, 24.5 percent (304) were women and 2.3 percent (28) were minority members. Among qualified seekers of clerical jobs, 85.2 per-

cent (6,587) were women and 4.3 percent (336) were minorities.[3] Many others could be qualified for such posts with some additional training.[4]

Affirmative Action Planning

Appendix B shows the comparison between the actual affirmative action plans of the six agencies studied in Iowa and the ideal affirmative action plan developed by the Advisory Committees from materials supplied by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Three of the six agencies selected in Iowa are similar in function to agencies selected in other States: the department of public instruction, the department of social services, the department of job services. The other three agencies were selected at random: the crime commission, banking commission, and secretary of State's office. Although the secretary of State's office has filed a "plan," it is really only a vague statement of principles.[5]

Some of the agencies that have plans collect data on the agency work force in order to compare it to the employed State labor force and State work force, but others, most notably the job service, do not.[6] Establishment of entry-level roles through which upwardly mobile minorities and women might be recruited is generally not well developed. Career ladder preparations are virtually nonexistent. The few recruitment efforts are incomplete and therefore unlikely to produce dramatic increases in the numbers of women and minorities who apply for posts. The departments of public instruction and social services have the best provisions in their plans for ensuring that minorities and females, once hired, receive equal opportunity in their government careers. But even these are rudimentary compared to what might be done. Evaluation methods are primitive, and responsibility is so dispersed that the probability of effective action is reduced. Given these deficiencies, it is obvious why existing plans have produced so few accomplishments.

Perceptions of Iowa Affirmative Action[7]

Agency Employees

Table 3.2 shows the interview question responses of employees at the six Iowa agencies studied. On many of the issues salient to effective affirmative action, State employees saw little success or sometimes no performance at all.

Interviewees also rated affirmative action efforts on a scale of 1 to 4, from inadequate to adequate. These ratings are given in table 3.3. Iowa government employees (based on this sample of six agencies) rate their agency affirmative action efforts at 3.2. This is about average for the four States.

Average ratings also are given in table 3.3 for the various race and sex groups of employees and for different ranks of employees. The rating differences between groups or ranks indicate differences in the degree of effective affirmative action perceived. For example, except for the employment security commission, agency heads are generally more convinced than other employees that their agency is doing well with regard to affirmative action.

Responses by specific State employees to specific questions provide detail to some of the patterns suggested by tables 3.2 and 3.3. In the banking commission, only the director reported a plan to be operational. In four other departments, only administrators are aware of the plan. Only in the employment security commission is there anything approaching general awareness of an affirmative action effort. Only the head of the department of public instruction and the administrator of the secretary of State's office recalled making a public commitment to affirmative action within the past year.

Although many EEO officers reported performing utilization studies, these are not widely publicized or reported in affirmative action studies. Few of those interviewed are aware of these efforts. Social Services Commissioner Kevin Burns pointed to senior minority and female persons already on board. Many administrators commented that minorities qualified for senior posts are hard to find, but one minority administrator complained that he is not used to his full capability.

Recruitment efforts are not perceived by State employees. This may explain the frustration of persons like Commissioner Burns, who had not found such efforts productive, although he stated he had done "everything under the sun." The employment service relied entirely on its own job bank for candidates.

Chart 3.1
Utilization of Minorities and Women by Iowa State Agencies

	Number of "Matches"	Administrative, Professional, & Technical			Salary Over $16,000			Total Work Force		
		MM	MF	WF	MM	MF*	WF	MM	MF	WF
Aging Com	5	+		+				+	+	+
Ag Com	5	+	+		+			+	+	
Atty Gen	4	+			+		+	+		
Auditor	2		+						+	
Banking	0									
Beer Liquor	1							+		
Blind Com	3			+			+			+
Civil Rights	4	+	+					+	+	
Commerce Com	1								+	
Comptrollers Ofc	5	+		+	+			+		+
Conservation Com	0									
Crime Com	3			+					+	+
Development Com	0									
Drug Abuse	2			+						+
Employ Seg	7	+	+	+			+	+	+	+
Environ Qual	0									
Energy	2	+						+		
Gen Services I	2							+	+	
Gen Services II	2		+						+	
Geological Survey	0									
Govs Staff	5	+	+					+	+	+
Health	5	+		+			+	+		+
History	5	+		+				+	+	+
Indust Com	2								+	+
Insurance	4	+					+	+	+	
Labor	4	+	+		+			+		
Law Enf Academy	4	+					+	+		+
Legislature	1	+								
Library Com	4			+				+	+	+
Medical Examiners	1									+
Merit Employ	3			+					+	+
Natural Res	0									
Nurse Examiners	3				+		+			+
Pharmacy Examiners	0									
Plan And Program	6	+	+	+			+	+	+	
Pub Des	1							+		
Employ Relations	0									
Pub Instruction	8	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
Pub Safety	0									
Regents	1									+
Revenue	2								+	+
Sec Of St	1									+
Soc Services	6			+	+		+	+	+	+

Chart 3.1 (Continued)
Utilization of Minorities and Women by Iowa State Agencies

	Number of "Matches"	Administrative, Professional, & Technical			Salary Over $16,000			Total Work Force		
		MM	MF	WF	MM	MF*	WF	MM	MF	WF
Soil Cons	1									+
Com On Women	2		+							+
Sup Ct	1									+
Transportation	0									
Treasurer	2								+	+
Watchmaking Examiner	0									
Minor Agencies	7	+	+	+			+	+	+	+
Total Of Agencies At Greater Than 80% Level		16+M	9+M	15+M	6+M		11+M	21+M	21+M	25+M
Percent of Major Agencies At or Above 80% Level		33	19	31	13	–	23	43	43	52

*State proportion in this category is less than 0.01 percent of work force.
+Means agency utilization in the category is greater than 80% of State government utilization in that category, a "match." Where an "M" appears, the average utilization of minor agencies is greater than 80% of State utilization.

Source: Data from States on file in Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The Iowa Legislature

Although the Iowa Legislature has only just begun to develop a nonpartisan professional staff, the Advisory Committees have analyzed it in the same fashion as other agencies. Minorities and women have been hampered in obtaining jobs in the legislature because they lacked political ties, but work has begun on a structured system of personnel administration of which affirmative action will be one component.

Minority Communities

The minority communities, both black and Hispanic, are unimpressed by the State's affirmative action efforts. Both complain about the failure of either merit system and of most of the agencies to deal with grassroots groups in Des Moines who might be able to supply qualified candidates. They believe the merit system is used to exclude minorities. The Hispanic leaders pointed to the absence of bilingual staff in merit systems as one part of the problem. Hispanic civil servants were reported to have been passed over for promotions for which they were qualified. One minority leader complained that "everyone goes through the motions of affirmative action but there are no results." Minorities are left with the "soft money" (temporary program) jobs. Minority group spokespersons expressed special concern about the failures to recruit black professionals and to place them in key positions.

One minority community leader pointed out that it is possible to evade the merit system testing procedure if a person is really needed. He argued that such procedures should be used to place qualified minorities who have difficulty with testing. He reported instances of Hispanic civil servants locked into relatively low level posts whom the merit system has been unwilling or unable to assist. Minority leaders complain that there is too little publicity for State affirmative action activities and too little chance for the community to provide input into the affirmative action planning process.

In short, the affirmative action efforts of the State agencies, however good or bad, lack credibility in the minority community, although two or

TABLE 3.2
Iowa Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities

	Agree (%)	Less likely to agree				
		Supervisory	Other			
			WM	MM	WF	MF
Affirmative action plan established	61.1			X	X	X
Affirmative action publicly supported by agency heads	38.9	X				
Utilization studies have been undertaken	19.4			X	X	X
Measurable goals have been set	19.4		X	X		X
Job descriptions have been evaluated	41.7			X	X	X
Ads placed in minority or women's media	25.0					
Examinations have been validated for bias	22.2			X		X
Action to recruit senior level minorities or women taken	27.8			X	X	X
Opportunity for upward mobility exists	50.0			X		X
Upward mobility training available	36.1			X	X	X
Promotions of affected classes to senior positions have occurred	55.6					
Minorities and women promoted into all units of an agency	38.9					
Minorities and women *not* concentrated in agencies that serve minority or women's interests	47.2					
Adequate grievance procedures exist	52.8					
Annual human relations training provided	19.4					
Minority and women given chance to maximize skills	50.0					
Effective monitoring and evaluation of efforts	13.9					

TABLE 3.3
Ratings of Iowa Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent

Race and Sex Groups	Minority Males	Minority Females	White Females	White Males
Agency Employees				
Department of Public Instruction	3.8	—	3.5	3.6
Social Services	1.4	2.2	3.3	3.1
Employment Security Commission	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.6
Crime Commission	—	3.0	3.9	3.3
Secretary of State	—	2.5	3.2	2.7
Banking	—	—	1.4	2.0
Community	2.1	—	—	—

Rank and Responsibility Groups	Chief	Personnel	EEO	Senior	Junior	Total
Agency Employees						
Department of Public Instruction	3.4	3.7	—	3.5	3.7	3.6
Social Services	3.1	2.9	—	3.0	3.0	2.9
Employment Security Commission	2.0	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.7
Crime Commission	3.7	—	2.9	3.7	3.5	3.5
Banking	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.2	0.6	1.7
Secretary of State	2.7	—	—	2.9	3.3	2.9

Source: Interviews conducted by Central States Regional Office staff.

three agencies are mentioned as having made some efforts. There is a general discontent over the state of affirmative action.

The interviews suggest that far less is actually being accomplished than is possible. The checkered pattern in planning recurs in assessments of performance. Much remains to be done in many, perhaps most, State agencies.

The Role of Responsible State Agencies

The Iowa Merit Commission is the most sophisticated of all the four States' merit system agencies in test validation. Its materials are used by State agencies throughout the region. It prefers content validation, contending that criteria validation (which is preferred by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and EEOC) cannot be effectively implemented. The agency has been operating on only two-thirds of full staff needed, which has prevented much activity. However, it has devised and implemented an applicant flow evaluation procedure.

Responsibility for compliance with affirmative action requirements is shared between merit systems and the Iowa Civil Rights Commission. Ms. Maude White, the staff person at the commission in charge of the State evaluations, prepares an annual report to the Governor on compliance by each State agency (including her own). Her office also provides technical assistance and training for agencies. A lack of direct access to the Governor has prevented more effective activity.

Summary

While the State work force approximates the employed State labor force, very few of the State's larger agencies' work forces match the State work force. Moreover, comparison of the utilization of minorities and women at high salary or senior level posts shows that only the employment security commission and the department of public instruction do consistently well (and even they have gaps in their performances). Data on the agency plans reveal dramatic gaps. That State employees and leaders of the minority and female groups differ in their perceptions of the effectiveness of affirmative action further suggests a large gap between what could be done and what has been done. The efforts of the two responsible State agencies are commendable, but they need more resources, staff, and authority and better access to decisionmakers if they are to rectify the deficiencies indicated.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Council of State Governments, *The Book of the States* (Lexington, Kentucky: 1974) p. 552; and data supplied by the Iowa Department of Job Services.

2. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Last Hired, First Fired* (February 1977), pp. 9–16.

3. Data supplied by the Iowa Department of Job Services.

4. Ibid.

5. The "plan" is a mimeographed statement of principles intended to be used as a model. Instead of writing a plan, the office merely filled in blanks on the statewide form. The secretary of State's office comments:

> As a small State agency I believe we are trying our best to comply with all available directives, procedures and spirit of the Civil Rights Commission. We do not have a large turnover and consequently not a lot of new employees. As we have advised Maude White of Civil Rights Commission, we are more than willing to try and hire minority persons if they or Merit or Job Services can supply us with an eligible person on the certified list of applicants.

J. Herman Schweiker, Deputy Secretary of State, letter to staff, May 10, 1977.

6. In its annual status report, data is presented which shows utilization. Goals and timetables are implied in the report. A more detailed affirmative action plan is being drafted. Colleen Shearer, director, Iowa Department of Job Services, letter to staff, May 11, 1977.

7. This section reports the results of interviews conducted in Des Moines, Iowa, Nov. 8–11, 1976.

Chapter 4

Affirmative Action in Kansas

The Setting

Kansas ranked 29th in the Nation in population in 1972 with 2,268,000 residents. The State's population is 4.7 percent black, 2.1 percent Hispanic, and 0.4 percent Native American.[1] Most of the minority population lives in the three large cities, which are (in order of size) Wichita, Kansas City (Kansas), and Topeka, the capital.

Kansas State government is a significant employer. Roughly 4.9 percent of the State's employed labor force is employed by the State. As of 1973, 41,359 persons were employed by the State's 135 agencies. Of these, 25,841 were protected by the merit system, including 4,290 in 6 State agencies required by the Intergovernmental Personnel Act to maintain Federal merit system standards. Size alone makes State government important in determining the extent of equal employment opportunity in the State.

The affirmative action efforts by State government are mandated by Federal law, State law, and executive order. The Kansas Act Against Discrimination (KSA 44–1001 et seq., as amended) prohibits discrimination in all employment. Governor Robert Bennett's Executive Order 75–9 (July 16, 1975) promulgated a statewide plan, to be drafted by the department of administration. Each agency was instructed to develop its own affirmative action plan that would coordinate with the State plan.

Kansas State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women

Governmentwide

Table 4.1 shows the race and sex composition of the Kansas State work force, both overall and by occupational group. This work force is similar in overall race and sex composition to the employed State labor force, for which overall race and sex proportions also appear in the table. Following the reasoning of the "Underutilization" section of the introductory chapter, the State work force can be accepted in this case as the standard against which to evaluate the agencies' affirmative action efforts.

By Agency

Chart 4.1 describes the performances of individual agencies in relation to the govermentwide performance. (The underlying data for this chart are in appendix A.) The chart shows whether an agency's work force "matches" the State work force's utilization of minority males, minority females, and white females. For each group this utilization analysis has been made agencywide, in top jobs, and at the highest salary level, giving a total of nine criteria indicating the extent of equal employment opportunity.

Minority and female employment at individual State agencies varies widely from the State work force norms. Of the 54 large agencies, not one matches the State for all nine criteria. Only four agencies match the State in as many as five of the nine criteria. These four relatively successful agencies are the secretary of State's office, social and rehabilitative services, Topeka State Hospital, and human resources; the minor agencies (those with 15 or fewer employees) also have been generally more successful than average. Nine agencies fail to match the State in any criterion: animal health; forest, fish, and game; Governor's committee on criminal administration; grain inspectorate; transportation; highway patrol; industrial reformatory; parks and recreation; and corrections.

For the agency work force as a whole, only the neurological institute and human resources match the State for all three race and sex groups. Sixteen agencies are deficient in all three of these criteria. Generally, women fare better than minorities, with 30 agencies matching the State total work force utilization of white women, 16 matching for minority women, and only 10 matching for minority males.

For utilization in "top jobs" (administrative, professional, and technical), well over half of the agencies fail to match the State proportions for

TABLE 4.1
Kansas Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class

KANSAS GOVERNMENT WORK FORCE*

Occupational Class	White Male (%)	White Female (%)	Minority Male (%)	Minority Female (%)
Professional, Technical & Paraprofessional	28.14	18.33	2.48	2.53
Administrator	8.34	.78	.52	.32
Clerical	2.26	14.39	.14	.99
Crafts & Kindred	8.48	.14	.45	.02
Maintenance	3.99	2.72	.75	.88
Protective Service	2.87	.28	.18	.06
All Occupations	54.07	36.63	4.51	4.79
Number of Employees	12,970	8,788	1,082	1,148
KANSAS EMPLOYED STATE LABOR FORCE**				
All Occupations	60.82	34.99	3.12	2.27

*Percentages are of entire work force.
**Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census, PC(1)-C18, table 54

any of the three race and sex groups. Only 12 agencies match the State proportion for white females in these positions, [illegible] minority females, and only 8 for m[illegible]. The only deviations from this unif[illegible] nance are human resources [illegible] in all three categories).

Of the 54 ag[illegible] three race ar[illegible] \$16,000-plus s[illegible] to their represen[illegible] at that level. Seven a[illegible] and sex categories, as did the minor agencies. Sixteen of the large agencies match for white women, 8 for minority women, and 7 for minority males.

In short, utilization analysis of Kansas State government shows agencies do underutilize by comparison with their own State work force. Only in a handful of agencies is utilization anything near what it should be. In a large number of agencies there is little or no utilization of minorities and women at more than the most minimal levels.

As discussed in the "Underutilization" section of the introductory chapter, the best remedy for imbalances among State agencies is not shuffling minorities and women from agency to agency, but additional hiring. Given the availability of Federal funding under programs of the U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce, such recruitment appears feasible.

A further justification for hiring more minorities and women is found in statistics on joblessness. The disparity in unemployment rates between whites (4.5 percent) and others (as high as 9.2 percent for blacks) is sufficiently large to suggest that minorities seeking work face greater difficulties than their white counterparts.[2] Kansas' job service reports that significant numbers of unemployed minorities and women are available for State employment. For example, among those available for managerial, professional, technical, and kindred jobs, 46 percent were female (2,487) and 12 percent (655) were minority members. Among available seekers of sales or clerical jobs, 80 percent (8,989) were women and 15 percent (1,701) were minorities.[3]

Affirmative Action Planning

Appendix B shows the comparison between the actual affirmative action plans of the six agencies studied in Kansas and an ideal affirmative action plan developed by the Advisory Committees from materials supplied by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (The State equal opportunity coordinator's comments on this analysis are ap-

Chart 4.1
Utilization of Minorities and Women by Kansas State Agencies

	Number of "Matches"	Administrative, Professional, & Technical			Salary Over $16,000			Total Work Force		
		MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF
Adj Gen	1				+					
Agriculture	1			+						
Animal Health	0									
Atty Gen	1				+					
Bank Com	1	+								
Corp Com	2						+			+
Correct Vocation Trn	3						+	+	+	
Crip Children	2			+						+
Administration	4					+	+	+	+	
Fire Marshall	2	+						+		
Forest, Fish, Game	0									
Govs Ofc	4					+	+		+	+
Gov Com Criminal Adm	0									
Grain Inspect	0									
Health and Environ	4			+			+		+	+
Transportation	0									
Hiway Patrol	0									
Historical Soc	2			+						+
Econ Dev	1									+
Correctional Inst	3						+		+	+
Indust Reformatory	0									
Topeka Youth	4	+			+			+	+	
Beloit Youth	1									+
Ins Dept	1									+
Atchison Youth	2							+		+
Neurological Inst	4					+		+	+	+
Employee Retire	2	+								+
Larned St Hosp	1									+
Legis Ed Plan	3			+			+			+
Legis Research	1									+
Osawatomie St Hosp	4				+	+			+	+
Parks and Pes	0									
Parsons St Hosp	3			+					+	+
Corrections	0									
State Pen	1							+		
Post Audit	2			+			+			
Recept and Diagnostic	3	+			+			+		
Revenue	2			+						+
Statues Revisor	3	+					+			+
Norton St Hosp	1									+
Sch For Blind	1								+	
Sec Of St	5	+			+		+		+	+

Chart 4.1 (Continued)
Utilization of Minorities and Women by Kansas State Agencies

	Number of "Matches"	Administrative, Professional, & Technical			Salary Over $16,000			Total Work Force		
		MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF
SRS	6		+	+		+	+		+	+
Dental Health	3			+			+			+
Soldiers Home	2								+	+
Education	4			+		+	+			+
Professionals Bd	2						+			+
Topeka St Hosp	5		+		+	+		+	+	
Treasurer	1									+
Medical Dept	1						+			
Water Res Bd	1						+			
Winfield St Hosp	3					+			+	+
Human Res	6	+	+	+				+	+	+
Minor Agencies	5	+			+		+		+	+
Total of Agencies at Greater Than 80% Level		8+M	3	12	7+M	8	16+M	10	16+M	30+M
Percent of Major Agencies at Greater Than 80% Level		15	16	22	13	15	30	19	30	56

+Means agency utilization in the category is greater than 80% of State government utilization in that category, a "match." Where an "M" appears, the average utilization of minor agencies is greater than 80% of State utilization.

Source: Data from States on file in Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

pended to this chapter.) Three of the six agencies selected in Kansas are similar in function to agencies chosen in other States: the department of education, the department of social and rehabilitative services, and the job service component of the department of human resources. The other three agencies were selected at random: the department of administration, the department of credit unions, and the water resources board.

Planning is compromised by the absence of any effort to compare the State labor force with agency work forces. The job service, which makes a statutory report to the U.S. Department of Labor on utilization, merely compares the employed State labor force to the existing work force and notes areas of improvement. The water resources board does the same and notes no need for action. The department of education published goals and timetables in June 1977. Other agencies make no comparisons whatever.

While the State plan calls for the establishment of special trainee classes, only the department of education, job service, and the water resources board indicate action likely to implement this proposal. If such trainee positions are to bring about significant change, there must also be career ladders that make possible the movement of the new entry-level workers into senior positions based on their merit and worth to the agency. No agency proposes specific career ladder programs, although the department of education is committed to such programs.

Education has the most comprehensive plan for recruitment. It sets goals for each section and proposes to contact appropriate sources to obtain qualified candidates. While all other agencies have some recruitment proposals, none is very specific. None of the agencies has very detailed arrangements for mechanisms likely to encourage the retention of minority and female employees. The department of education and the job service propose to monitor applicant flow, to some degree.

The department of education has clarified responsibility for program evaluation and imple-

mentation. The department of administration proposes to use the personnel division's applicant flow data, when these become available. Other agencies propose no specific evaluation efforts. The disparities between these proposed activities and those which might have been planned are self-evident.

Perceptions of Kansas Affirmative Action[4]

Agency Employees

Table 4.2 shows the interview question responses of employees at the six Kansas agencies studied. On the salient aspects of affirmative action, only seldom did State employees note positive action.

Interviewees also rated affirmative action efforts on a scale of 1 to 4, from inadequate to adequate. These ratings are given in table 4.3. Kansas government employees in the six agencies rate their agency affirmative action efforts at 3.1. This is about average for the four States.

Average ratings have also been calculated for the various race and sex groups of employees and for different ranks of employees. The rating differences between groups and ranks indicate differences in the degree of effective affirmative action perceived. For example, except in social and rehabilitative services, senior and junior staff rank their departments lower than does the chief executive.

Specific comments by State employees reiterate the patterns suggested by tables 4.2 and 4.3. Typical of these comments were the notation by the director of SRS that he had ordered a study of the race and sex composition of his agency's work force, and the comment by some other employees that SRS has no formal outreach efforts to attract women and minorities for potential jobs. Some minorities and women in the job service asserted that they are locked into lower level jobs when they are qualified for and doing supervisory work. Some women noted that job description statements are unnecessarily inflated.

A rather innovative activity among State agencies is the water resources board's task force procedure. This involves professionals and clericals who give equal input in projects of concern to the department. It provides a splendid opportunity for career development and mutual understanding.

The Kansas Legislature

The Advisory Committees also reviewed the affirmative action efforts and perceptions of the legislature. The legislative personnel office reports that it made serious efforts a few years ago to recruit minority candidates, without success. It claims it is limited because so many of the jobs are part time. The office has been reluctant to make a new effort, both because of prior failure and because the office already has so many applicants.

The legislative reference service has been inhibited by the speed with which it must recruit. It will usually hire the first person available who is qualified. The number of people on its lists of applicants has impeded it from searching outside. The chief administrative secretary is a black female. Of eight professionals in the fiscal section, one is a woman and one a Hispanic person. Of 16 professionals in the research section, four are women but none minorities. The agency is now beginning to advertise posts as they become available.

Minority Communities

Minority community leaders are most concerned about the use of the "rule of five," under which agency hiring officers get to choose one from the top five on a list. They believe that this allows administrators to exclude minorities. They blame administrators who are reluctant to hire minorities for the lack of minority middle managers. They do not see any sign of a special outreach to attract minority candidates. In consequence, the community does not get to know about jobs. Even those aware of a position may lack job-finding skills. One female community leader reported that women are not allowed to decide for themselves whether they want to travel—it is assumed that women with children will not want to travel. She called for more use of flex-time (employees work a fixed number of hours per day, but have flexibility on starting and finishing) so that women who have children can work. There is a general feeling among the leaders of minority and women's groups that affirmative action just is not working for their constituencies.

TABLE 4.2
Kansas Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities

	Agree (%)	Less likely to agree				
		Supervisory	Other			
			WM	MM	WF	MF
Established affirmative action plans	51.3			X	X	
Agency head has reaffirmed commitment in past year	43.6			X	X	X
Work force anlyzed	20.5					
Underutilization has been determined	12.5					
Job analysis has been conducted	25.6					
Measurable goals have been set	15.4					
Minorities and women are promoted to senior level positions	25.6			X		X
Minorities and women are *not* concentrated in units dealing with minorities or women	30.8					
Recruitment sources have been developed	10.3					
Job descriptions have been evaluated	30.8					
Interview techniques have been evaluated	15.4					
Ads are placed in minority or women oriented media	25.5					
Tests have been validated for bias	10.3					
Action to recruit minorities and women for senior level posts has been taken	20.5					
Adequate grievance procedures exist	53.8					
Upward mobility system exists	20.5		X	X	X	X
Staff development programs exist	28.3					
Human relations training given	23.1					
Minorities and women are maximizing skills on job	30.8					
Program evaluated	10.8					

TABLE 4.3
Ratings of Kansas Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent

Race and Sex Groups	Minority Males	Minority Females	White Females	White Males
Agency Employees				
Education	2.3	—	3.1	3.6
Social Rehabilitative Services	3.1	3.6	—	3.6
Human Resources	3.4	3.6	—	3.2
Water Resources Board	—	—	3.5	3.6
Credit Unions	—	—	1.4	1.5
Administration	2.4	2.3	3.8	2.6
Community	2.4	—	—	—

Rank and Responsibility Groups	Chief	Personnel	EEO	Senior	Junior	Total
Agency Employees						
Education	2.9	3.6	—	2.8	2.9	3.0
Social Rehabilitative Services	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.4
Human Resources	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.3
Credit Union	1.4	1.2	1.7	—	1.6	1.5
Water Resources Board	3.6	3.2	—	—	3.6	3.5
Administration	2.6	2.1	1.7	1.6	3.5	2.7

Source: Interviews conducted by Central States Regional Office staff.

The Role of Responsible State Agencies

The State's personnel office is committed by the State's affirmative action plan to a comprehensive revision of the testing procedures, recruitment process, and job categorization. It is also given responsibility for monitoring flow patterns.

At present the review has been in process for a year. During that time a content validation procedure has been implemented. The personnel office has also developed the data to monitor applicant flow and responses to various recruitment campaigns. It devised the trainee program, by which a candidate who cannot meet the basic requirements for a regular position can be given a trainee slot and then allowed 1 to 2 years to meet the basic requirements for the position. This option is not available in the merit system's grant-in-aid agencies, governed by Federal employment regulations under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act.

The personnel office reported that the State is a substantial employer of women in nonclerical positions, albeit mainly in fields usually associated with women. However, it reports that it has found women for nontraditional jobs as well. The extent of the success of these efforts could not be measured.

Formal responsibility for administering the State's affirmative action program rests with the director of equal employment opportunity (a part of the department of administration). However, this authority is limited to classified employees.[5] The office monitors the affirmative action efforts of the departments, collects basic data, and coordinates the efforts to achieve affirmative action. It has published several reports and provided conferences and other technical assistance for the agencies.

The State equal opportunity office noted that "...small as it may be in relation to the mission it was assigned [it] has devoted considerable energy and time to a program activity that was met with mixed feelings throughout Kansas State government."[6] Its assessment of its affirmative action efforts in the State is:

> At the present, the State as a whole generally is on target with an adequate number of minorities and females being reported in the work force. The remaining task at hand is to work with agencies on an individual basis and to make sure *all* agencies are moving toward their goals. Further efforts need to be made by many agencies in the types and kinds of jobs held by minorities and females, rather than just to hire minorities and females. Aggressive recruitment campaigns for professional and upper level administrative jobs need to be conducted as well as counseling and training to allow current employees the opportunity for upward mobility. The efforts put forth will be rewarded by the opportunity, for the employer, to select from a group of highly qualified applicants at all position levels.[7]

Summary

Although, overall, Kansas State government employs minorities and women proportionate to their share of the employed State labor force, underutilization characterizes most State agencies' work forces when their proportions of women and minorities are compared to the State work force. The affirmative action plans are uneven. By the criteria of the model plan, the six agencies reviewed are deficient on more than one of the principal tasks. The proportion of those interviewed who report successful implementation of any of the major tasks of affirmative action is very small, even in the highest levels of the agencies.

It has been suggested by the State equal employment director that if the Advisory Committees assert that implementation of the plan is feeble, the Committees should "query the Governor, legislators and top administrators who alone control the direction this program is moving or not moving."[8] The continued existence of deficiences in the level of utilization and the quality of affirmative action measures, 5 years after equal opportunity was mandated by Federal law, suggests that there has indeed been a failure of leadership.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Council of State Governments, *Book of the States* (Lexington, Kentucky, 1974), p. 553; and data supplied by Kansas Department of Human Resources.

2. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Last Hired, First Fired* (February 1977), pp. 9–16.

3. Data supplied by Kansas Department of Human Resources.

4. This section is based on interviews conducted in Topeka, Kansas, week of Nov. 8, 1976.

5. The Equal Employment Opportunity Office comments:

Therefore in accordance with Governor Bennett's Executive Order, the Equal Employment Opportunity office in the State of Kansas requires affirmative action plan goals and timetables on only classified employees.

Further research in the decision not to include unclassified employees is supported by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended Title VII, section 701(f), which states, "The term employee means an individual employed by an employer except that the term employee shall not include any person elected to public office in any State or political subdivision of any State by the qualified voters thereof, or any person chosen by such officer to be on the officer's personal staff, or an appointee on the policymaking level or an immediate advisor with respect to the exercise of the constitutional or legal sentence shall not include employees subject to civil service laws of a State government, governmental agency or political subdivision."

Pat Ortiz, EEO Consultant, letter to staff, July 21, 1977.

6. Pamela McClelland-Cooper, letter to staff, May 24, 1977.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

Chapter Appendix

STATE EEO COORDINATOR'S COMMENTS ON COMPARISON OF KANSAS STATE AGENCIES' AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS WITH MODEL PLAN

Task 1—Compare Manpower Pool With Employed Work Force

State Agency—Department of Education

For the most part, this office would concur with the "no action" specified by the committee with the exception of Item 2. Evidently, the committee overlooked a work force analysis of the Department which indicated race and sex composition of the work force compiled in September, 1976. Items 1, 3 and 4 had not been treated properly when it was reviewed. This office was knowledgeable of these omissions in the Department's affirmative action plan. It should be noted that on January 25, 1977, this Department submitted additional material which the committee sought under Items 1, 2, and 4. At this date, the Department's plan is considered acceptable by this office.

State Agency—Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

The affirmative action plan evaluated by the committee was approved by this office July 7, 1976. Programmatic, rather than statistical goals were submitted. The proportion of minorities to nonminorities and females to males in its overall work force precluded this office from requesting the information which the committee was seeking. Overall, this office does not recognize underutilization. What underutilization there is occurs in limited EEO categories and units or institutions, i.e.: Youth Center at Beloit and Norton State Hospital. The Department has 13.54 percent minorities and 70.40 percent females within its work force as of December 31, 1976. Similarly, the minorities and females are spread equitably throughout the various EEO categories in the Department. The Department's main thrust was and is maintaining the status quo but refining certain portions of its commitment to equal employment opportunity. The Department is currently revising its affirmative action plan. This office would take exception to the "no action" specified in the report.

State Agency—Job Services (Department of Human Resources)

This office would concur that there are no deficiencies in this Department relative to the task assignment. It has incorporated all the items spelled out by the committee in its affirmative action plan.

State Agency—Department of Administration

Per memorandum from Pamela McClelland-Cooper dated August 12, 1975, all Divisions in the Department were not required to fashion separate affirmative action plans, but rather to adopt the State Affirmative Action Plan. Quarterly statistical information has been submitted by each Division since affirmative action planning was initiated in state government.

It is anticipated that in the near future each Division will construct and implement their own full-blown affirmative action plan in light of the static activity of numerous Divisions. This office would concur with the report of the committee.

State Agency—Water Resources Board

This agency, while relatively small (23 classified employees), has developed an acceptable affirmative action plan. Goals to correct underutilization have been established. Until the spring of 1976, from 1974, to that date, the agency employed 12.5 percent minorities in its work force. Since the latter date, the agency has lost its minority employees, but it has aggressively recruited in an attempt to replace these individuals with minorities.

This office does not concur with the findings of the committee on this task.

State Agency—**Department of Credit Unions**

This agency had and has less than 15 classified employees and therefore, like other similar agencies, was not required to construct affirmative action plans. However, agencies with work forces of less than 15 employees are required by this office to submit quarterly statistical reports and to have adopted the non-discriminatory policies contained in the Executive Order and State Affirmative Action Plan.

This office considers this agency exempt from establishing an affirmative action plan and therefore, the activity of the committee is not applicable.

State Plan

The State Affirmative Action Plan is not considered a "full-blown" affirmative action plan, at least from a statistical standpoint. It was constructed to serve as a guideline and example for all other state entities subject to affirmative action planning to follow.

Task 2—Analyze Entry Level Roles

Validation studies are continuous and ongoing in the Division of Personnel within the Department of Administration to properly determine the entry level requirements for the approximate 850 jobs classes in state government. Individual state agencies can request the Division of Personnel to initiate validation. State agencies are not responsible alone for consummating this activity and they are not being held accountable for this activity in their respective affirmative action plans.

This office would take exception to the findings of the committee on this task. Records in the Division of Personnel indicate that activity in validation has increased tremendously, and this is not an activity addressed in agency affirmative action plans. It is entirely incongruous for the committee to hold each agency accountable for this task since the Division of Personnel is responsible for this task.

Task 3—Career Ladder Opportunities

This office would concur with the committee's findings that this task has not been properly addressed in agency affirmative action plans. This entire concept needs full study and implementation throughout state government. No doubt many jobs in state government are dead end because of the lack of established various job groups. To accomplish this task in state government would in part entail revamping and reclassification of many of the current job specifications—a job of enormous magnitude of which the Division of Personnel has.

Task 4—Recruitment

The Recruitment Section in the Division of Personnel was established in 1976 to assist all state entities in this activity. All state entities are asked to coordinate this activity with the Division of Personnel. If certified eligible lists are not provided by the Division, agencies are requested to recruit and advertise vacancies independently. Some of the agencies reviewed by the committee have been quite active in diligently seeking out minorities. Item 7 is being monitored on a quarterly basis. Item 6 penalizes all groups, not just the affected class members, and therefore is not deemed relevant. Item 9 has been accomplished for all state entities subject to affirmative action planning. Items 10 and 11 can be addressed only by the Division of Personnel and, consequently agencies should not be held accountable.

This office would care to indicate that this, of all activities in affirmative action planning, is scrutinized very closely. There is no question that lack of this activity in the past has precluded minorities from employment opportunities.

Task 5—Retention

Grievance policy procedures and exit interviews are a reality in the Departments of Human Resources, Social and Rehabilitation Services, and Education. The Water Resources agency will soon be asked to implement these tools as a result of review by this office. The Department of Administration has not implemented these procedures. By and large there is considerable attention given to the subject of retention by the agencies reviewed.

Task 6—Evaluation

Evaluation strategies and monitoring systems have been established for purposes of affirmative action planning throughout state government. Regardless of the findings of the committee on this task, considerable time and attention is devoted to these subjects. Eight reviews have been conducted of agencies aside from the quarterly statistical report monitoring. This task is being met.

Task 7—Responsibility

EEO Coordinators have been designated in all state entities with the ultimate authority resting with appointing authorities and cabinet secretaries. Only Item 3 has not been properly addressed under this task. This office would concur that line supervisors should be held responsible for implementation of affirmative action planning and should consequently be measured by performance evaluations.

Pamela McClelland-Cooper, letter to staff, May 24, 1977.

Chapter 5

Affirmative Action in Missouri

The Setting

Missouri ranked 18th among the States in size and 14th in population in 1972 with 4,747,000 residents. The population is 10.3 percent black, 0.8 percent Hispanic, and 0.1 percent Native American. The capital, Jefferson City, located in the middle of the State, is the 11th largest city in the State.[1]

Missouri State government is a large employer, with 65,284 employees on the payroll in 14 large and 2 small State agencies. Of these, 25,319 are covered by the merit system, 9,011 of them in eight grant-in-aid agencies which are required by the Federal Intergovernmental Personnel Act to maintain Federal merit system standards. Roughly 3.7 percent of the employed State labor force is employed by the State. Size alone makes State government's efforts significant in setting the climate for affirmative action efforts in Missouri.

Affirmative action efforts by State government are mandated by both Federal and State law. Nondiscrimination in employment is required by Missouri statute and an executive order issued by former Governor Christopher Bond on September 10, 1973.[2] Each State agency is required by this order, and an accompanying memorandum, to have an affirmative action plan.

Missouri State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women

Governmentwide

Table 5.1 shows the race and sex composition of Missouri's State work force, both overall and by occupational group. This work force is similar in overall race and sex composition to the employed State labor force, for which overall race and sex proportions also appear in the table. Following the reasoning in the "Underutilization" section of chapter 1, the State work force can be accepted in this case as the standard against which to evaluate the individual agencies' affirmative action efforts.

By Agency

Chart 5.1 describes the performances of individual agencies in relation to the governmentwide performance. (The underlying data for this chart are in appendix A.) The chart shows whether an agency's work force "matches" the State work force's utilization of minority males, minority females, and white females. For each group, this analysis has been made agencywide, in top jobs, and at the highest salary level, giving a total of nine criteria indicating the existence of equal employment opportunity.

There are significant differences between the proportions of minorities and women in the State work force and comparable proportions in individual State agencies. Of the 16 agencies for which data were presented to the Advisory Committees, only the department of mental health matches the State work force proportion in every one of the nine criteria. Four other agencies match in five or more criteria, and the remaining agencies match in fewer than five—that is, less than half the criteria. The departments of highways and transportation fail to match in any criterion.

For utilization in the total agency work force, five agencies fail to match the State proportion for any of the three race-sex groups, and another eight agencies match for only one of them. White females fare best, with nine agencies matching the State proportion; only three match for minority females and for minority males.

The agencies are more successful with regard to employment in top jobs. Five agencies match the State proportion for all three gender groups, although three fail to match in any group. Again, white females fare best, with 13 agencies matching the State work force proportion, as opposed to only 6 for minority females and 5 for minority males.

With the exception of the department of mental health, agency utilization of minorities and women at the $16,000-plus level is dismal. No agency except for mental health utilized minorities, male or

TABLE 5.1
Missouri Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class

MISSOURI GOVERNMENT WORK FORCE*				
Occupational Class	**White Male (%)**	**White Female (%)**	**Minority Male (%)**	**Minority Female (%)**
Professional, Technical & Paraprofessional	22.06	20.70	1.89	5.85
Administrator	2.92	2.12	.21	.40
Clerical	1.80	17.86	.14	1.97
Crafts & Kindred	13.34	.12	.35	.03
Maintenance	3.20	2.87	.84	1.31
Protective Service	4.43	.15	.24	.04
All Occupations	43.33	43.67	3.43	9.56
Number of Employees	14,489	14,603	1,148	3,198
MISSOURI EMPLOYED STATE LABOR FORCE**				
All Occupations	58.60	33.95	5.07	4.62

*Percentages are of entire work force
**Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census, PC(1) C27, table 54

female, in proportions matching the State work force, and only 6 of the 16 agencies match for white females.

In short, the performance of most of the State agencies in matching the State work force proportions of women and minorities is remarkably poor. Only in mental health is utilization what it should be. Only the departments of labor and industrial relations, elementary and secondary education, consumer affairs, and social services come even halfway toward adequate utilization by this test.[3] Some of the differences in performance may reflect successful recruitment by some agencies which have units in centers of substantial minority population.

As discussed in the "Underutilization" section of chapter 1, the best remedy for imbalances among State agencies is not shuffling minorities and women from agency to agency, but additional hiring. Given the availability of Federal funding under programs of the U.S. Departments of Commerce and Labor, such recruitment appears feasible.

A further justification for hiring more minorities and women is found in Missouri's statistics on joblessness. There are disparities in unemployment rates between whites (6.2 percent) and others (rising to as high as 12.9 percent for blacks) sufficiently large to suggest that minorities seeking work face greater difficulties than their white counterparts.[4] Similarly, the 7.4 percent overall unemployment rate for women indicates that women generally have greater difficulty than the average jobseeker in finding work.[5] Missouri's job service reports that significant numbers of unemployed minorities and women are available for State employment. Of those available for professional, technical, and kindred jobs, 18.7 percent (3,539) were minority members and 38.1 percent (7,259) were female. Of those available for clerical jobs, 20.7 percent (8,539) were minority members and 72.9 percent (30,059) were women.[6]

Affirmative Action Planning

Appendix B shows comparisons between the actual affirmative action plans of the six agencies studied in Missouri and an ideal affirmative action plan developed by the Advisory Committees from materials supplied by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Three of the six agencies selected in Missouri are similar in function to agencies chosen in the other States: the departments of elementary and secondary education (DESE), social services, and labor and industrial relations (DOLIR). The other agencies were selected at random: the departments of transportation, conservation, and natural resources.

While all the departments, save transportation, make some effort to compare their agency work

Chart 5.1
Utilization of Minorities and Women by Missouri State Agencies

	Number of "Matches"	Administrative, Professional, & Technical			Salary Over $16,000			Total Work Force		
		MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF
Higher Ed	3			+			+			+
Pub Safety	1			+						
Highways	0									
Administration	2			+				+		
Transportation	0									
DOLIR	6	+	+	+			+		+	+
Elemen Sec Ed	5	+	+	+			+			+
Conservation	1									+
Consumer Affairs	5	+	+	+			+			+
Mental Health	9	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Agriculture	2			+				+		
Revenue	3		+	+						+
Social Services	6	+	+	+			+		+	+
Govs Staff	2			+						+
Natural Res	1			+						
St. Louis Airport	1			+						
Total of Agencies at Greater Than 80% Level		5	6	13	1	1	6	3	3	9
Percent of Agencies at or Above 80% Level		31	38	81	6	6	38	19	19	56

+Means agency utilization in the category is greater than 80% of State government utilization in that category, a "match."

Source: Data from States on file in Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

force with the employed State labor force, only the job service (of DOLIR) indicates its intention to establish specific goals and timetables based on such analysis. (No Missouri agency reviewed by the Advisory Committees has actually done so in its plan.) Conservation notes disparities revealed by the comparisons, but the other departments content themselves with merely reporting the data on their agency work forces and on the employed State labor force.

Only the job service and department of natural resources have specific plans to introduce entry level jobs. The others have no plans on this matter.[7] Similarly, only the job service and natural resources agencies plan career ladders to ensure upoward mobility for qualified employees.[8]

All agencies, save transportation, have some proposals to recruit increased numbers of minorities and women. Natural resources, however, believes the burden of this responsibility lies with the State personnel division. The department of education proposes to make better use of its minority and female personnel in the hiring process, as well as communicating better with applicants. Job service proposes to make use of the job service bank to recruit. Conservation seeks to revise its recruitment materials.[9] All those State agencies affected by Chapter 36, *Revised Statutes Missouri*, work through the State personnel division for recruitment. It has been argued that agency recruitment is fruitless if systematic discrimination exists in the merit system entry process. Some State employees argue that merit systems frustrate recruitment efforts.[10]

Education, conservation, and natural resources propose to establish human relations committees

TABLE 5.2
Missouri Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities

		Likely to Disagree				
			Others			
	Agree (%)	Supervisory	WM	MM	WF	MF
Affirmative action policies have been established	73			X	X	X
Commitment to affirmative action has been reaffirmed	48.6			X	X	X
Analysis of agency work force has been done	37.8					
Determination of underutilization has been made	21.6					
Measurable goals have been set	18.9		X	X	X	X
Minority and female orgs. have been contacted	35.1			X		
Job analyses have been conducted	45.9			X		X
Interview techniques have been evaluated	32.4					
Ads are placed in minority and female oriented media	32.4					
Examinations have been validated for bias	29.7					
Action to recruit senior level minorities and women has been taken	51.4		X	X	X	
Opportunities for upward mobility exist	40.5					
Minorities and women are promoted to upper level jobs	48.6					
Minorities and women receive upward mobility training	35.1					
Grievance procedure effective	68.2			X		
Minorities and women are not concentrated in units which serve minorities and women	35.1					
Minorities and women are maximizing skills on job	48.6			X	X	
Evaluation of program has been undertaken	8.1			X	X	X

to help make their affirmative action programs work on a day-to-day basis. Social services, natural resources, and conservation propose grievance procedures.

Only the department of social services proposes a comprehensive evaluation of affirmative action efforts. Natural resources and DESE propose desk review of the numbers of minorities and women hired. The other three agencies propose no evaluation.

Many departments split authority for implementation. This is true of DESE, DOLIR, conservation, and natural resources. Social services assigns specific authority to the full-time chief human relations officer. The departments of education, social services, and natural resources place clear final authority in the hands of their chief executive officers.

Despite many good features in individual plans, considerable disparities exist between the plans presented and the model plan. This may help to explain why the plans have produced so few accomplishments.

Perceptions of Missouri Affirmative Action[11]

Agency Employees

Table 5.2 shows the interview question responses of employees at the six Missouri agencies studied. Seldom did more than half of the employees interviewed report that they were aware of any agency effort regarding salient points of affirmative action. The elements of affirmative action most important to actual implementation (such as goal setting) were reported adequate by only one-third of employees. Those most concerned with the creation of new opportunities are less likely than the average employee to report the existence of significant agency efforts.

Interviewees also rated affirmative action efforts on a scale of 1 to 4, from inadequate to adequate. These ratings are given in table 5.3. Missouri government employees (based on this sample of six agencies) rate their agencies' affirmative action

TABLE 5.3
Ratings of Missouri Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent

Race and Sex Groups	Minority Males	Minority Females	White Females	White Males
Agency Employees				
Elementary & Secondary Education	—	3.4	3.3	3.0
Social Services	2.4	3.0	3.6	3.1
Labor and Industrial Relations	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.5
Conservation	2.8	—	3.3	3.3
Natural Resources	2.8	2.9	2.2	2.9
Transportation	—	—	1.3	2.2

Rank and Responsibility Groups	Chief	Personnel	EEO	Senior	Junior	Total
Agency Employees						
Elementary & Secondary Education	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.2
Social Services	3.4	2.8	2.4	3.4	3.3	3.1
DOLIR	3.6	3.4	—	3.1	3.4	3.4
Conservation	3.4	3.1	3.2	2.7	4.0	3.2
Natural Resources	2.7	3.0	3.2	2.6	2.5	2.7
Transportation	2.2	—	—	1.4	1.2	1.6

Source: Interviews conducted by Central States Regional Office staff

efforts at 3.2. This is about average for the four States.

Average ratings also are given in table 5.3 for the various race and sex groups of employees and for different ranks of employees. The rating differences between groups or ranks indicate differences in the degree of effective affirmative action perceived.

Whites see affirmative action as more successful than do minorities. Chief executives judge their agencies' efforts to be more complete and successful than do personnel officers or affirmative action officers (except in the department of natural resources). Senior staff were less pleased than junior staff about program efforts to date.

Department of natural resources staff members are more likely to be aware of their agency's plan than are staffs of any other agency. Natural resources staff members seem particularly enthusiastic about improvements in their agency's affirmative action efforts. They are most conscious of the need for greater efforts. By contrast, former Transportation Director John Brawley stated that he did not feel a compelling push to get black people into State government and that he did not see them around in other departments. He stated that his staff knew he was an equal opportunity employer, although he had not stated this publicly. In most departments other than natural resources some, but not all, persons in the department were aware of the affirmative action plan.

Reaffirmations of support for affirmative action are particularly important if minorities are to believe the agency is sincere. However, only in the department of labor and industrial relations and in the department of natural resources did minorities report that public statements of support of affirmative action by the department director had occurred in the last year.

Some administrators commented that equality existed because tests were open to all comers. By and large, only administrators asserted that their agencies had taken steps to determine that all qualified minorities were being used to their fullest capacity.

While only one-third of those interviewed reported that minority and women's organizations had been contacted for applicants, several departments, including conservation, reported that they

had tried to recruit for technical posts, without success. They expressed the hope that publicity about their minority hires would encourage more minority members and women to apply. Conservation determined to concentrate on urging high school students into training programs leading to careers in conservation as its method of increasing the stock of applicants.

Clericals in some departments complained of frustration at having no way to move upward without a college degree. Yet a degree does not seem to them to be necessary for many higher jobs for which it is required.

Only in the departments of conservation and social services did minorities and women report they might get senior posts. Only in the department of labor and industrial relations did minorities believe they were not deliberately concentrated in certain units. Beginning professionals in several departments complained that getting in and moving up are more difficult for minorities and women than necessity requires.

Minorities in the departments of labor and industrial relations, education, and social services were most likely to report their skills were being fully used. Women in the departments of labor and industrial relations, education, conservation, and social services also reported that their skills were fully used.

The Missouri Legislature

The staff of the legislature includes relatively few black or female employees. The State legislature has yet to take a stand favoring affirmative action for itself. The small size of the central staffs and the relatively large number of slots filled by legislators at their own discretion limits opportunities for implementing an affirmative action program. The legislative reference service is for the most part a legal unit. It reports that only young lawyers from rural areas are attracted by its salaries, which are very low.

In the Missouri House of Representatives most of the jobs are part-time or at the discretion of members. Black members, one observer noted, bring in black staff; white members, white staff. One guard, one secretary, two bill room clerks, and two custodians are black. However, the hiring system occasionally works well. For example, out of eight or nine temporary researchers hired on the recommendation of the speaker, one might be a black or female. There are 60 full-time staff, which would appear to be a sufficient number to allow development and implementation of an affirmative action policy and program.

The Senate has a permanent staff of 133. Out of 39 male employees, 4 are black. Out of 94 female employees, 6 are black. The Secretary of the Senate states that he sought to recruit staff from Lincoln University, without much success.[12] More usually, he relies on senators to make recommendations. Since the legislative full-time staff totals 193, there appear to be sufficient numbers to support an affirmative action program.

Newspapers reviewed by staff do not report any decision by the legislature to impose an affirmative action plan upon itself, much less upon the State departments. Recently, House Speaker Kenneth Rothman issued instructions that more minority and female professionals be hired. The effects of this are not apparent.

The Role of Responsible State Agencies

In a study conducted in May 1976, evaluators from the Intergovernmental Personnel Division of the U.S. Civil Service Commission reported that the Missouri "personnel division has begun to take positive steps in providing EEO leadership to Merit System agencies but further commitment of resources is necessary." The report recommended that the personnel division take the lead in collecting work force data and applicant flow data. It urged personnel to develop a standard employment form and to include on the form information that "clearly informs applicants that equivalent substitution of education and experience is permitted." The reviewers called on the personnel board to assume responsibility for merit systems appeals. On some of these recommendations, the personnel division asserts it will take action as part of its new plan for 1976–77. On others the division states it lacks statutory or administrative authority.

The personnel division is skeptical about line agency complaints about the merit system. It asserted that those agencies that have a good affirmative action plan and staff are not complaining about the merit system. Those that have a poor reputation are complaining. The division asserted it is moving as fast as it can on validation of ex-

aminations and of job requirements but is concerned about the collection of new data, which it regards as an administrative nightmare. Overall, the division asserted that it is in the top 10 of all State personnel agencies in successfully implementing nondiscriminatory selection.

Others both in State government and the community take a different view. It has been asserted that personnel has always been able to make any appointment it really wants to make. It should be possible to extend this prerogative to benefit minorities and women. Promotional examinations could be abolished. Those who do their work should be promoted without further testing if they are capable of performing at the next higher position.

In a speech to students in Kansas City, Joseph C. Gunnell, a personnel officer who is in charge of the division of personnel's human relations program, commented on the difficulty of bringing in minorities and women. The State equal employment effort, he said, is highly decentralized. No one person coordinates the effort. While some departments, such as the division of family services, mental health, and natural resources, have a significant number of minorities, others have none. He urged his department to further action.[13]

Summary

While the State work force approximates the employed State labor force, few of the agencies' work forces match the State work force. Moreover, comparison of the utilization of minorities and women at the highest salary level show that only for white women do even a third of the State agencies' work forces match the State work force. In top jobs, while most agencies do well in employing white females, only a third do well in their employment of minorities. The agency plans have dramatic gaps. Analysis of affirmative action efforts by State employees suggests large gaps between what could be done and what is being done. The personnel division is only beginning to take positive steps on affirmative action but is not doing all that could be done, and there is no evidence of effective internal leadership on affirmative action within the agency.

In sum, there is evidence of interest in affirmative action, but this does not extend to all of the State departments or the entire legislature. Clearly little change is likely to occur without further substantial modifications in official procedures for outreach, recruitment, testing, placement, promotion, and retention of employees and without much more sophisticated analysis of program effects than now exists. Former Governor Christopher Bond's order for affirmative action has not produced a comprehensive effort.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. Council of State Governments, *Book of the States* (Lexington, Kentucky: 1974), p. 562.

2. Chapter 36, Revised Statutes Missouri.

3. The Missouri Department of Conservation comments:

> Your statistical analysis did not take into consideration employee turnover. Since our Department has a very low employee turnover, it limits our opportunities to recruit new employees and thus limits the opportunity to hire minority employees.
> The comparison of the percentage of minority and female employees with white employees does not reflect length of service, a major factor in salary comparisons.

Mike C. Milonski, Assistant Director, Missouri Department of Conservation, letter to staff, May 2, 1977 (hereafter cited as Conservation Response).
This comment reinforces the Advisory Committees' concern. The historic failure of State agencies to employ qualified minorities and women in State offices has resulted in bureaucracies that are overwhelmingly white and male. The absence of qualified minorities in State government suggests to minorities and women that they have no place. To the extent that this belief prevails, word-of-mouth recruitment and informal promotion requests, so often the basis of hiring or promotion, cannot help minorities and women. It is for just this reason that the Advisory Committee believes that efforts to change the State's system of recruitment and promotion are so essential.

4. Data supplied by Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DOLIR).

5. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Last Hired, First Fired* (February 1977), pp. 9–16.

6. Data supplied by DOLIR.

7. "Many of our positions are technical in nature and require degrees in Forestry, Fisheries and Wildlife Management." Conservation Response.

8. "Our Department is relatively small and this limits the feasibility to establish career ladders and maintain good management practices." Conservation Response.

9. "The largest percentage of blacks are located in the Kansas City and St. Louis metropolitan areas. The majority of our employees are in the rural areas of Missouri, which is not geographically appealing to the metropolitan black population. This fact makes it somewhat difficult to recruit black applicants." Conservation Response.

10. Staff interviews in Jefferson City, Missouri, week of Nov. 22, 1976.

11. This section reports the results of interviews conducted in Jefferson City, Missouri, week of Nov. 22, 1976.

12. Information supplied by the Secretaries of the Legislature.

13. *Kansas City Star*, Oct. 21, 1976.

Chapter 6

Affirmative Action in Nebraska

The Setting

Nebraska ranks 15th among the States in size but only 35th in number of residents, with a 1972 population of 1,528,000. The population is 2.7 percent black, 1.4 percent Hispanic, and 0.4 percent Native American. Most of Nebraska's minority population is concentrated at the eastern end of the State in Omaha. Lincoln, the capital, is the second-largest city.[1]

Nebraska's State government is a significant employer. As of 1973, 102 State agencies of varying size and function employed 27,027 persons. Of these, 1,828 are covered by a merit system (1,557 in nine grant-in-aid agencies required to maintain Federal merit system standards by the Intergovernmental Personnel Act). Roughly 4.7 percent of employed Nebraskans work for the State. Size alone makes State government important in determining the extent of equal opportunity in the State.

The affirmative action efforts by State government are mandated by both Federal and State Law. Nebraska law requires nondiscrimination in employment,[2] but only federally-funded agencies are under obligation to have affirmative action programs. Other agencies are urged by the State personnel division to have such programs, but are not required to do so.

Nebraska State Government Utilization of Minorities and Women

Governmentwide

Table 6.1 shows the race and sex composition of Nebraska's State work force, both overall and by occupational group. This work force is similar in overall race and sex composition to the employed State labor force, for which overall race and sex proportions also can be found in the table. Following the reasoning of the "Underutilization" section of the introductory chapter, the State government work force can be accepted in this case as the standard against which to evaluate the agencies' affirmative action efforts.

By Agency

Chart 6.1 describes the performance of individual Nebraska agencies in relation to the governmentwide performance. (The underlying data for this chart are in appendix A.) The chart shows whether an agency's work force "matches" the State work force's utilization of minority males, minority females, and white males. For each group, this analysis has been made agencywide, in top jobs, and at the highest salary level, giving a total of nine criteria indicating the extent of equal employment opportunity.

Minority and female employment at individual State agencies varies widely from the State work force norms. Of the work forces of Nebraska's 38 large agencies, only two—those of the departments of health and welfare—match the State work force in as many as five of the nine criteria. Eleven agencies fail to match on *any* of the nine criteria. The remaining agencies match on from one to four of the criteria.

For the agency work force as a whole, no agency matches for all three race-sex groups, although health, labor, EOC, and economic development match for two. Fifteen agencies fail to match for any of the three. Only 9 of the 38 agencies match for minority males and only 6 for minority females. White females fare somewhat better with 13 matches between the State work and the work forces of the largest agencies. The minor agencies, in aggregate, also match the State work force.

Chart 6.1 shows a dismal picture of employment in top salary positions. There are so few minority females earning at the $16,000-plus level in the State that statistically reliable comparisons of agency work forces to the State government work force could not be undertaken. Only four agencies match for minority males and only two for white females; no agency matches for both. White females are also adequately represented at this salary in the minor agencies, though minority males are not.

In "top jobs" (administrative, professional, and technical), the departments of health and welfare match for all three race-sex groups; EOC and education match for two of three, as do the minor agencies. However, 24 agencies fail to match for any of the three categories. Of the larger agencies, 11 match for minority males, 4 for minority females, and 5 for white females.

In short, the largest number of Nebraska's agencies utilize minorities and women at only the most minimal levels. Only two agencies, health and welfare, have records of even modest success.

As discussed in the "Underutilization" section of the introductory chapter, the best remedy for imbalances among agencies is not shuffling minorities and women from agency to agency but additional hiring. Given the availability of Federal funding under programs of the U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce, such recruitment appears feasible.

A further justification for hiring more minorities and women is found in statistics on joblessness. The disparities between unemployment rates for whites (3.7 percent) and those for other groups (rising to as high as 8.6 percent for blacks) is sufficient to suggest that minorities seeking work face greater difficulty than their white counterparts.[3] Nebraska's job service reports significant numbers of minorities and women employed and available for State employment. For example, among those available for professional, technical, and managerial positions, 11.2 percent (1,393) are minorities and 38.8 percent (1,359) are women. Of those available for clerical jobs, 11.7 percent (493) are minority members and 84.1 percent (3,544) are female.[4]

Affirmative Action Planning

Appendix B shows comparisons between the actual affirmative action plans of the six agencies studied in Nebraska and an ideal affirmative action plan developed by the Advisory Committees from materials supplied by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Three of the six Nebraska agencies selected for analysis are similar in function to agencies chosen in other States: the department of welfare, the department of education, and the job service element of the department of labor. The other three agencies were selected at random: the department of health, the insurance commission, and the law enforcement and criminal justice commission.

The insurance commission has no affirmative action plan at all, while the plans of the other five agencies are very incomplete. Only the department of labor has a complete analysis of its work force. Although the job service utilizes the U.S. Department of Labor's Standard Form for Work Force Analysis (ETA 4–51) requiring comparison of employed State labor force and work force, it makes no real effort to consider the implications of the data. The other four agencies have no visible analysis at all (although the department of welfare began such an analysis after the Nebraska Advisory Committee's review).

None of the agencies has made specific proposals that would create entry level roles suitable for the large number of economically and educationally disadvantaged members of "protected classes." None of the agencies has made any proposals to provide effective upward mobility to remedy the disproportionate concentration of protected classes in lower salary and lower status jobs. Proposed reforms in recruitment procedures are not likely to assure a supply of upwardly mobile members of protected classes. There is virtually no evaluative effort.

In Nebraska, a State employee directly charged with affirmative action duties is titled an "affirmative action officer." In some agencies this is a full-time job; in others it is merely a responsibility added to the duties of an existing position. Despite the existence of this title, in several agencies responsibility for affirmative action was diffuse or difficult to ascertain.[5] However, the crime commission and the department of education have delegated responsibility clearly, and, after the Advisory Committee's review, the department of public welfare appointed a full-time affirmative action officer.

Given these deficiencies it is not surprising that the plans have produced few accomplishments.[6]

Perceptions of Nebraska Affirmative Action[7]

Agency Employees

Table 6.2 shows the interview question responses of employees at the six Nebraska agencies studied. Most employees do not believe that their

TABLE 6.1
Nebraska Government Work Force by Race, Sex, and Occupational Class

NEBRASKA GOVERNMENT WORK FORCE*

Occupational Class	White Male (%)	White Female (%)	Minority Male (%)	Minority Female (%)
Professional, Technical & Paraprofessional	24.04	19.99	.97	.71
Administrator	5.40	.68	.17	.03
Clerical	1.57	18.27	.01	.35
Crafts & Kindred	2.66	.21	.07	.00
Maintenance	4.62	9.14	.18	.22
Protective Service	9.53	.39	.33	.07
All Occupations	48.93	47.97	1.73	1.37
Number of Employees	3,537	3,468	125	99
NEBRASKA EMPLOYED STATE LABOR FORCE**				
All Occupations	61.69	35.64	1.82	1.47

*Percentages are of entire work force
**Source: U S Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census, PC(1)-C29, table 54

agencies have made initiatives crucial to affirmative action. According to table 6.2, for example, the only State affirmative action initiative reported by more than half of the interviewees is the recruitment and promotion of minorities and women to senior level posts. Either affirmative action initiatives have not been mounted or they have been so ineffectively promoted that their potential beneficiaries remain unaware of their existence. On many crucial questions, Nebraska's employees' ratings for agencies are lower than those in other States.[8]

Interviewees also rated affirmative action efforts on a scale of 1 to 4, from inadequate to adequate. These ratings are given in table 6.3. Nebraska's government employees rate their agencies' affirmative action efforts at 2.9. This is somewhat below the average for the four States.

Average ratings also are given in table 5.3 for the various race and sex groups of employees and for different ranks of employees. The rating differences between groups or ranks in table 6.3 indicate differences in the degree of affirmative action perceived.

There is a very considerable disparity in some of the agencies between the perceptions of minorities and those of white males. There are less severe disparities in some agencies between white females and white males.

Senior staff, except in the departments of health and education, are less likely to view affirmative action as adequate than are chief executives or others concerned with affirmative action.

Only in the departments of education and welfare are junior employees aware of any affirmative action efforts, and even this may be deceptive. A senior level white female in one agency commented that her agency has no real affirmative action plan, although one exists on paper.

Only in the department of education and in the insurance commission did staff recall a recent executive statement of commitment to affirmative action.[9]

Although underutilization studies are the appropriate start for affirmative action, only in the department of labor did an administrator report that underutilization studies have been carried out. Only there did administrators, much less other staff, believe that goals and timetables have been set. Part of the reason for this low awareness of

responsibility for affirmative action is that some agencies have minorities or women in mid-level positions assigned to affirmative action responsibilities. This insulates agency heads from any immediate responsibility and conceals the extent of activity (or inactivity).

Problems in recruitment were noted. One senior level person noted that in her agency questions about marriage and child-rearing intentions are still asked. Commissioner Gerald Chizek, department of labor, commented that testing prevents hiring of minorities. He argued that tests should be permissive, not determinative.

Although minorities and women are reportedly promoted in all agencies to senior level posts, one senior level subunit head noted that women are excluded from the men's lunch and athletic groups, where many important decisions are actually made.

Administrators in the departments of insurance, labor, and welfare reported adequate progress has been made in developing "career ladders." Minority persons in the departments of health and labor also believe such efforts have been made in their agencies, but at least one senior female clerical found herself in a constant battle to get specifications changed. Another female clerical reported that her supervisor, a woman, is capable of doing the work of a higher job but will not get it because a college degree is required. This is an obstacle to upward mobility. Several agencies, including the law enforcement and criminal justice administration, report they have programs to assure avenues for upward mobility.

Only in the department of labor do many employees share the administrator's view that full use is being made of the skills of minorities and women. In no other agency do minorities take this view.[10]

The Nebraska Legislature

State Senators Shirley Marsh and Wally Barnett were interviewed about employment practices in the State legislature. At the time of the interviews, there was one black secretary, employed by the only black senator. A second black senator has since entered the legislature.

Senator Barnett pointed out that senators hire their own secretaries. There is no general control over who is hired. Although he recalled only a few females in senior legislative positions, he insisted that the senate does not discriminate in employment. He believed minorities would be hired if they applied and were qualified. Although individual members may be sympathetic, the legislature has not passed any resolution imposing an affirmative action obligation on itself.

Minority Communities

Perhaps most striking about minority and female community leaders' responses to affirmative action in State government is their almost total lack of comprehension of its potential value to them. While their organizations are getting copies of job announcements, they seldom refer candidates. They perceive the merit agencies as particularly unlikely to accept persons they would recommend. They believe the examination process is intended as a screen against minorities rather than an opportunity.

None of those interviewed saw any sign of effective affirmative action programs that might serve to encourage minority applicants. The minority community leaders have very limited personal contact with personnel officers or recruitment people from either merit systems or department of personnel. There is much suspicion of discrimination, but no hard evidence. Members of the minority community see no point in applying for jobs that they believe to be in reality closed to them.

Leaders of women's groups have somewhat similar perceptions. They see the examination process with its rigidities as an excuse to prevent women from taking examinations and therefore becoming eligible for employment.

In short, affirmative action appears as absent from the perceptions of observers of State government as it is from the perceptions of those on the State's payroll. Such failures to perceive affirmative action are consistent with the actual absence of serious agency affirmative action planning.

The Role of Responsible State Agencies

Responsibility for affirmative action in State government is divided. There are two State personnel units: the personnel department (covering nonmerit) and the merit commission.

The Nebraska merit system staff has done a partial analysis of recruitment of minorities and

Chart 6.1
Utilization of Minorities and Women by Nebraska State Agencies

	Number of "Matches"	Administrative, Professional, & Technical			Salary Over $16,000			Total Work Force		
		MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF	MM	MF	WF
Legis Council	2					+				+
Sup Ct	1									+
Dist Ct	0									
Govs Ofc	1									+
Sec Of State	1									+
Auditor	0									
Atty Gen	1									+
Treasurer	3			+			+			+
Education	3	+		+						+
Revenue	1	+								
Aeronautics	0									
Agriculture	1		+							
Banking	0									
Health	5	+	+	+					+	+
Fire Marshall	1								+	
Insurance	0									
Labor	3	+						+	+	
Motor Vehicles	1									+
Minor Agencies	4		+	+			+			+
Welfare	5	+	+	+			+			+
Roads	2	+						+		
Military	1							+		
Game and Parks	1				+					
Liquor	0									
Workmens Comp	1									+
Brand Committee	0									
Corrections	1							+		
Ed TV	1								+	
Historical Soc	0									
J T Merit	2			+						+
State Patrol	0									
Adm Services	3	+			+			+		
EOC	4	+	+					+	+	
Tech Assist	3	+			+			+		
Econ Develop	4	+			+			+	+	
Law Enforc	0									
Personnel	2	+						+		
Environ Control	0									
Employee Rete	1									+
Total of Agencies at Greater Than 80% Level		11	4 +M	5+M	4	1	2+M	9	6	13+M
Percent of Major Agencies at or Above 80% Level		33	12	15	12	3	6	27	18	39

+Means agency utilization in the category is greater than 80% of State government utilization in that category, a "match." Where an "M" appears, the average utilization of minor agencies is greater than 80% of State utilization.

Source: Data from States on file in Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

TABLE 6.2
Nebraska Government Employees' Perceptions of Agency Affirmative Action Activities

		Less likely to agree			
			Other		
	Agree (%)	Supervisory	WM	MM	WF	MF
Affirmative action plan has been established	27.5			X		X
Reaffirmation of affirmative action by agency head during past year	20.0					
Work force has been analyzed	15.0					
Determination of underutilization has been made	12.5					
Goals have been set	10.0					
Job analyses have been conducted	20					
Interview techniques have been evaluated	22.5					
Ads are placed in media oriented to minorities or women	10.0					
Exams have been validated for cultural bias	12.5		X	X	X	
Recruitment of minorities and women for senior level posts has occurred	40.0					
Minorities and women have been promoted to senior level posts	55.0					
Mobility systems have been designed	15.0					
Adequate upward mobility training exists	32.5			X	X	X
Human relations training is conducted annually	17.5					
Women and minorities are not concentrated in units which serve women and minorities	50					X
Minorities and women are utilizing their skills on the job	40			X		

TABLE 6.3
Ratings of Nebraska Agencies' Affirmative Action Efforts, by Type of Respondent

Race and Sex Groups	Minority Males	Minority Females	White Females	White Males
Agency Employees				
Education	—	2.2	3.4	2.7
Welfare	1.7	2.7	2.4	3.4
Labor	2.8	4.0	3.4	3.5
Health	3.0	—	2.8	3.0
Insurance	2.8	—	2.2	2.8
LECJ	—	—	2.6	2.1
Community	1.8	—	2.0	—

Rank and Responsibility Groups	Chief	Personnel	EEO	Senior	Junior	Total
Agency Employees						
Education	—	—	2.7	3.3	2.8	2.9
Welfare	3.4	2.7	—	2.5	2.3	2.6
Labor	3.5	3.4	3.2	2.7	4.0	3.4
Health	2.8	2.3	—	3.0	2.9	2.7
Insurance	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.5	1.8	2.5
LECJ	2.3	1.9	—	2.1	3.0	2.4

Source: Interviews conducted by Central States Regional Office staff.

women. It finds that while more minorities (14.7 percent) are applying for six entry level professional jobs than would be expected by available labor force data, most are applying for the lower paying jobs. Too few minorities are applying for the upper level jobs. Women are more evenly represented, but still are not applying proportionately for the top administrative jobs included in the merit system study. The merit staff notes that the mailing list used to send out recruitment materials does not include any minority organizations in the State of Nebraska.[11]

The 1975 affirmative action plan for the merit system specified action by the system office to contact community groups, participate in job studies, and develop performance evaluation reports. The agency uses a job analysis questionnaire developed by the Iowa merit system agency to validate exams. It is a content validation procedure.

The merit commission reports that out of 493 job descriptions, 210 have been validated. The commission also believes line agency interview techniques remain primitive.

The commission reports that it has most difficulty in recruiting Native Americans. The merit commission asserts that black and Hispanic persons recruited for senior level posts soon move to Federal or private agencies for better salaries. For the moment, the merit commission is most concerned about the recruitment of women, since recently women's organizations have been applying the most pressure on the commission.

The personnel department (which administers nonmerit system employment) reports it has made some efforts at affirmative action, with the assistance of a Federal Intergovernmental Personnel Act grant. But each user of the department's services sets its own affirmative action standards. The personnel department is simply a sieve through which applications pass.

During the course of this study, an ad hoc committee including legislators and executive staff prepared a study for the Governor on affirmative action in the State. Its report noted that:

> ...males are overrepresented in the official, administrator and professionals categories. This follows the traditional pattern of utilizing males in such areas. Women are predominantly in the office and clerical category and are minimally used in the officials and administrators, protective service workers, paraprofessional, and skilled craft workers categories.[12]

The committee proposed a comprehensive affirmative action effort through the introduction of a statewide affirmative action plan. This plan would place specific requirements for affirmative action on State personnel agencies as well as all operating agencies employing 10 or more persons. As of March 1977, the success of this proposal could not be determined.

Summary

While the State work force matches the employed State labor force, few of the State's larger agencies' work forces match the State work force utilization of minorities and women at high salaries, in senior posts, or agencywide. Only the departments of health and welfare have been successful in as many as half these categories. Data on the agency plans reveal dramatic gaps. Analysis of affirmative action efforts by State employees and leaders of minority and women's organizations suggests large gaps between what could be done and what has been done. Both central personnel agencies would agree that they have a long way to go before they will have an effective affirmative action program. Community and staff also see little progress toward real affirmative action.

Notes to Chapter 6

1. Council of State Governments, *Book of the States* (Lexington, Kentucky: 1974), p. 564.

2. Nebraska Revised Statutes, CS Ch. 48, Act. II, Fair Employment Practices Act.

3. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Last Hired, First Fired* (February 1977), pp. 9–16.

4. Data supplied by the Nebraska Department of Labor.

5. For example, in the welfare department the authority for affirmative action rested with the chief executive although there was an affirmative action officer. Responsibility is split between the affirmative action officer and the personnel officer.

The Department of Education comments:

> Sufficient resources are still needed to accomplish our program goals, let alone our employment goals. In line with this is the fact that the position of affirmative action officer is not the single function of a single individual within our organization, but is one of many functions the assigned person assumes within our agency.

Commissioner Anne Campbell, Nebraska Department of Education, letter to staff, May 14, 1977.

6. Commissioner Campbell comments, in the letter cited above:

> The report states that emphasis should not be placed on reverse discrimination and yet the agencies studied are chastised for not doing just that. We do not feel that affirmative action requires reverse discrimination, but rather speaks to hiring the best qualified person for the job in an affirmatively unbiased manner. To address this belief, the State Department of Education has adopted updated hiring procedures which support the philosophy of affirmative action.
>
> The Affirmative Action Committee within the Department of Education is currently conducting an evaluation of its first affirmative action plan with the goal of a revised plan to be taken to the State Board of Education in December. As we continue to work with the affirmative action plan, we believe that it will become more than just a paper plan. It will become a commitment of all the staff within the agency. Efforts are being made toward this commitment.

7. This section reports the results of interviews conducted by staff in Lincoln, Nebraska, week of Oct. 18, 1976.

8. The Nebraska Department of Welfare comments:

> Your evaluation of our affirmative action efforts is generally accurate relative to the time of your study. As of February 22, 1977, we have a person appointed whose primary responsibility is affirmative action. An analysis of staffing patterns and personnel policies is currently being undertaken preparatory to committee work on the overall affirmative action planning and implementation. It is our purpose to comply with the law and reflect this in our employment policies and practices.
>
> Part E [now the "Perceptions..." section of this chapter] of your report was based upon an opinion and attitude survey. There is no way to dispute your results, even though it was only a sample and not a complete survey. There have been no significant steps taken to publicize our affirmative action plan, because it has been only a proposed effort toward equal opportunity. Once we have developed a viable and approved affirmative action plan, implementation will include in-agency training and publicity efforts.

Eldin J. Ehrlich, Director, Nebraska Department of Public Welfare, letter to staff, May 3, 1977.

9. The welfare department believes this will change when its affirmative action program become effective. Ibid.

10. Commissioner Chizek questions the appropriateness of the analysis of respondents' comments. Gerald Chizek, letter to staff, Apr. 28, 1977. The Advisory Committees believe that this information is a good indicator. Methodology is reviewed in chapter 1.

11. Domingo H. Cabacungan, *Partial Analysis of the Recruitment Functions of the Nebraska Merit System Office* (n.d., unpublished).

12. Affirmative Action Ad Hoc Committee, *Report of the Committee Recommending an Affirmative Action Program* (Jan. 28, 1977).

Chapter 7

The Role of Federal Monitoring and Review Agencies

Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs (BIPP)

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (IPA) authorizes the U.S. Civil Service Commission to provide technical assistance for State agencies (as well as local governments) that wish to come into conformity with Federal standards of employment. It also mandates conformity by "grant-in-aid" agencies who pay State employees with Federal funds to run federally-funded programs. The U.S. Civil Service Commission has been delegated review authority for personnel standards of State or local grant-aided agencies. The Commission's Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs (BIPP) carries out this function.

The regulations enforcing IPA include 78 standards in 15 fields that define personnel policy standards. Only one field with 6 criteria directly relates to affirmative action. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has detailed the failings of BIPP in the management of affirmative action.[1] It reports that BIPP has wholly failed to take measures that would promote effective affirmative action policies and programs by State and local governments or by grantees.

The Bureau's regional office (IPPD) for Region VII administers the program in the Central States region. Victor Young, the office chief, asserts that at least 30 standards would have to be violated before he would recommend a finding of nonconformity to his headquarters. Mr. Young informed staff of the Advisory Committees that while an agency must have an affirmative action plan—something more than a general policy statement, with specific goals and timetables—absence of a well-conceived plan would not be grounds for recommending a finding of nonconformity. There has never been a finding of nonconformity in the region. Mr. Young asserts, "We administer merit system standards but the ultimate accountability doesn't rest with us." His powers, he believes, are largely those of persuasion.[2]

Substantial sums are granted by IPPD to the States for programs under IPA. Most funding to State government is granted under a formula. In 1976 the four States received $295,955.59 under the formula and $23,100 in discretionary grants. During 4 years (1972–76), about two-thirds went to personnel management improvement and one-third to training or grant administration for State and local allocations. Table 7.1 indicates the proportion of resources available from IPPD for affirmative action efforts. Most of the funding in the category "All Funding Having EO Benefit" reflects test validation and reclassification efforts, which, while they benefit women and minorities, are primarily undertaken to increase efficiency of staffing. In short, despite the significance of affirmative action, only a small proportion of BIPP funding is directed towards achieving it.

Some State agencies have been subject to qualitative evaluations or have received technical assistance from IPPD. In Missouri, the personnel division was last reviewed in February 1974. Welfare was reviewed in 1973, social services in May 1975, and employment security in October 1975. All received a day or more of technical assistance. The Iowa merit agency was last reviewed in May 1974. Iowa social services and employment security were last reviewed in 1973. All received fractions of a day of technical assistance in 1975 and 1976. Nebraska's merit systems agency was last reviewed in June 1974. The department of public welfare was last reviewed in May 1975. Employment security was last reviewed in July 1975. All received fractions of a day of technical assistance aid in 1975 and 1976. In Kansas the State personnel division was last reviewed in August 1973, SRS in July 1975, and the employment security division in January 1976. All received fractions of a day of technical assistance in 1976.

While qualitative reviews and technical assistance do occur at regular intervals, there are varying gaps between reviews and visits. Despite these visits and reviews, and in the face of the data

presented in the four State chapters, IPPD has continued to report compliance by the grant-in-aid agencies and their personnel systems. IPPD contends that conditions considerably improved during this period and that if affirmative action is not yet real, it is closer than it was when FY 1972 began.[3]

At the end of FY 1976 new instructions were issued by BIPP for grant agencies. These called for between two and four EEO reviews during a fiscal year, but allowed self-evaluations as comparable to IPPD onsite reviews. The memo went on to assert that:

> Based on information available in BIPP, the major weakness in our EEO reviews effort is follow up to determine if recommendations are followed and improvement occurs. In FY 1977 we will be especially concerned with grantee responses to review recommendations.[4]

It is too soon to determine the effectiveness of this new directive. But it is clear that this does not address many of the complaints about current practice raised by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

> 1. CSC's regulations for administration of the Merit System Standards are not precise enough to ensure adequate enforcement of the civil rights requirements of the Standards.
>
> 2. Although the regulations require the adoption of affirmative action plans to ensure equal employment opportunity, they fail to specify what the plans should contain and they do not designate a format for the plans.
>
> 3. CSC's regulations require that, where there is a lack of substantial conformity with Merit Standards which cannot be resolved by negotiation, CSC must notify Federal grantor agencies of its findings and recommend that grant termination proceedings be initiated. Although the regulations do not define the term "substantial conformity," they imply that mere noncompliance would not be sufficient for CSC to recommend fund termination.
>
> 4. CSC's guidelines do not clearly require State governments to develop as part of affirmative action plans:
>
> a. utilization
>
> b. periodic review of goals and timetables
>
> c. use of goals and timetables where needed.
>
> 5. CSC guidelines for conducting compliance reviews of State government agencies pose questions, some of which are quite vague, for the reviewer's consideration, but the guidelines do not inform the reviewer what constitutes an acceptable response to the questions, nor do they contain instructions on what actions should be required if responses to the questions indicate noncompliance with equal employment opportunity regulations.[5]

Staff were told by many State agency officials that they do not have copies (or could not recall having seen copies) of the various U.S. Civil Service Commission publications on affirmative action. There is no clear mechanism for assuring that personnel officers are regularly supplied with such publications as *EEO for State and Local Governments*, which provides periodic comment on the art of affirmative action. Even the Civil Service Commission's basic publication, *Equal Employment Opportunity in State and Local Governments, A Guide for Affirmative Action*, is generally unknown.[6] Nor does it occur to State agencies that Federal assistance can be provided at no charge to them for limited consultations.

The profile of IPPD with regard to affirmative action in Region VII is clearly very low, at this point in time.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)

Compliance activities in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are limited. GAO has pointed to the difficulties experienced by HEW's Office for Civil Rights.[7] Internal control mechanisms have also been limited.

The internal mechanisms are hampered by the demise of Social and Rehabilitative Services. This has prevented any effective inhouse monitoring of State affirmative action by the agency most concerned.

But it is also true, as the Department's EEO officer points out, that since the regional units set a poor example it is hardly surprising that the State agencies see themselves given broad exemption from affirmative action regulations.[8]

Department of Labor

The U.S. Department of Labor's monitoring is conducted by the various administrative units. The largest programs subject to review are employment

TABLE 7.1

Affirmative Action Funding in Region VIII Through IPP, FY 1972–76 (percent of total IPPD funding in State)

State	All Funding Having EO Benefit (%)	Funding for a Specific EO Activity (%)
Nebraska	44	16
Missouri	69	25
Kansas	28	10
Iowa	28	18

Source: IPPD

services and CETA. Evaluation is to be done every quarter by a personnel management specialist, but the position was vacant from October 1976 until July 1977. As expressed by Robert Gatewood, regional EEO director in FY 1977, the Department believes the principal problem with that position was getting suitable candidates onto the register.[9]

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)

EEOC reported that it does not have authority to require affirmative action planning, except as part of conciliation on a speedy remedy. Its efforts have been directed to the development of voluntary programs by State governments. EEOC is unable to estimate the volume of State requests.[10] They appear to have been infrequent (at least until recently).

EEOC does receive individual complaints about State discrimination in employment, which are processed through conciliation and mediation, and in some instances go to litigation. If the State and complainant cannot come to agreement the matter must be turned over to the U.S. Department of Justice for civil action.

The process outlined does provide for coordination but does not encourage it. EEOC may have many complaints in its files against State agencies, yet other Federal agencies with monitoring responsibilities may remain unaware of these, in part because of court-imposed restrictions, and despite interagency agreements to share data where Federal funds are used. So constrained is EEOC on publication of data that it cannot even publish data on a State by State basis showing the utilization of minorities and women and has contented itself with publishing regional figures.[11]

Given the large backlog at EEOC, by the time there is public recognition of a pattern of complaints about a State agency many years of Federal funding may have passed without the funding agency ever having been informed that a possibly discriminatory pattern exists. From the point of view of State government it would appear that EEOC is not significantly involved in the effort to obtain effective affirmative action.

Summary

For a variety of reasons including confused responsibility, unclear guidelines for determining noncompliance with affirmative action requirements, reluctance to declare noncompliance based solely on affirmative action, reluctance to assert leadership on affirmative ation, and inadequate staff, Federal agencies have not done much that can be shown to have substantially changed the affirmative action practices of States in recent years. Indeed, one State equal opportunity official pointed out that plans and programs reported as inadequate or deficient by the Advisory Committee had been found acceptable by the various Federal compliance agencies. In fact, the Federal agencies usually keep plans on file but do not review them. The failure of State agencies to approach the quality of the model programs is not merely the agencies' fault. It also reflects the reluctance of Federal agencies with statutory authorities to use those authorities to promote affirmative action.

Notes to Chapter 7

1. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort—1974*, vol. V, *To Eliminate Employment Discrimination* (July 1975), chapter 2.

2. The U.S. Civil Service Commission comments:

> With regard to the assertion in the CCR report that it would require violation of at least 30 standards before the IPPD Chief in this region would recommend that a jurisdiction was *not* in "substantial conformity" with the Standards (reference Page 113), this statement is inaccurate and not used in proper context. While it is true that one or even several deviations from the provisions of the Standards do not necessarily constitute a lack of "substantial conformity," it is also true that a single deviation, depending on its extent and significance, can constitute a serious non-conformity issue (e.g., State of Alabama's refusal to assure equal opportunity in employment which resulted in funds being withheld and court action to effect change). The essence of "substantial conformity" is to allow reasonable flexibility and diversity insofar as particular methods and techniques of personnel administration are concerned while at the same time requiring (assuring) that such standards and techniques are substantially equivalent to those stipulated by the Federal grantor agencies or (now) CSC.

3. Victor Young, bureau chief, staff interview, Kansas City, Mo., Feb. 15, 1977.

4. U.S., Civil Service Commission, *Operations Memo*, Sept. 24, 1976.

5. *Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort*, pp. 625–30.

6. The U.S. Civil Service Commission comments:

> The statement on the top of Page 117 that "state officials" have not received or cannot recall receiving CSC EEO and affirmative action publications is inexplicable and in our view, inaccurate. And certainly a clear mechanism for distribution of such materials throughout the region does exist. Briefly, the St. Louis Region, CSC, maintains a list of some 800 key officials, *including personnel officers*, of all State and local government agencies, institutions of higher learning, and public interest groups. EEO materials are routinely mailed to *all* persons included on this mailing list. We additionally furnish copies of these same materials to all Federal agencies who deal with our clientele so that they also may advise on availability of this literature.

Dunn Letter.

7. U.S., General Accounting Office, letter report to Senator Birch Bayh, Mar. 30, 1977 (HRD 77–78).

8. Robert H. Roane, HEW, staff interview, Kansas City, Mo., Dec. 2, 1976.

9. Robert Gatewood, staff interview, Dec. 10, 1976.

10. Charles Collins, compliance coordinator, staff interview, July 26, 1977.

11. U.S., Equal Employment Opportunity, *Minorities and Women in State and Local Government, 1973* (1976), vol. 8.

Chapter 8

Conclusions, Findings, and Recommendations

Equal employment opportunity has been required by Federal law and enforceable under the provisions of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as amended in 1972. Yet States know little about the practice of affirmative action, so necessary if equal opportunity is to be achieved. Both official and educational channels have failed to convey effectively to the agencies the basics of affirmative action.

Data on the State labor force, which includes all those available and potentially available for work, have never been collected by the four States examined in this report. Nor have State government-wide utilization analyses been conducted to which the labor force data can be compared. The Advisory Committees have consequently used the State work force as a surrogate measure to explore the key issue of underutilization of women and minorities by State agencies.

The four States exhibit some common features. The Committees have found that many agencies in each State underutilize minorities and women in "top jobs," in the best paying jobs, and in their agency work force as a whole.

Agency affirmative action plans do not match the standards of the Advisory Committees, much less the standards established by private enterprise. No agency has a complete plan.

The efforts of Federal agencies have had little recent impact on affirmative action in these States. Federal standards and the point at which those standards will be backed by sanctions have never been defined so as to compel effective State efforts.

Although there is no regular pattern, good efforts by a few agencies in each State conceal the failure of most when the State work force as a whole is the sole basis of analysis. Nor are affirmative action programs uniformly effective. There is no correlation between plans and programs.

Affirmative action efforts are not perceived by all staff to be effective. The discrepancies in perceptions among different levels of State employees and between State employees and the community are evidence of problems in implementation. There are similar disparities of perception between all State employees and the leaders of minority and women's organizations.

But nearly everyone interviewed favors affirmative action. It is clear that if good intentions were sufficient, affirmative action would be a success. The findings and recommendations listed below are directed toward these intentions. They reflect the choices of the Advisory Committees for the priorities that State, agency, and Federal officials must adopt if affirmative action intentions are to become realities.

Therefore, on the basis of a 9-month investigation and comments received from reviewers on a draft of this report, the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights submit the following findings and recommendations to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and to the State agencies authorized to implement them.

Area of Recruitment

Finding: The courts have agreed that the standard for determining underutilization of women and minorities is the labor force of the area from which employees are recruited. For most State government posts this area is the State, but for some skilled jobs, a larger area, perhaps the Nation, is appropriate.

Recommendation: Affirmative action and personnel officers of the States and their agencies should ensure that, to the extent possible, everyone in the labor force appropriate to the job is aware of the opportunity. For the specialized jobs this may require a nationwide recruiting effort.

Underutilization Analysis

Finding: Although State labor force statistics are essential to determining underutilization, these are unavailable. Only data on the employed State labor force and some data on the unemployed are available. The remaining availability factors (such

as trainable persons, persons completing suitable training courses, etc.) have not been calculated by the States in their labor force estimates. Without this data, precise underutilization analysis is impossible.

Recommendation: The States' Governors, through the States' personnel departments, should conduct statewide underutilization analyses, part of which should be calculation of State labor force data, including all availability factors. This could be assisted by the four States' MIKN Selection Information Exchange. Funding should be sought through the Federal Intergovernmental Personnel Act.

Training and Qualifications

Finding 1: The testing process, whether by written or skills test or by interview, remains a barrier to the entry of minorities and women. While the Advisory Committees recognize the limits of legal responsibility, implied in *Washington v. Davis*, they believe that the quest for affirmative action demands that tests be free of discriminatory aspects. The only way to ensure this is to include an evaluation of discrimination in the validation process. While the arguments for content validation have merit, the Advisory Committees have found that only criteria validation allows a check for discrimination.

Recommendation 1: The four States' personnel agencies should strengthen the MIKN Selection Information Exchange so that it can validate by the criteria method all tests, both written and informal.

Finding 2: Many personnel officials and agency executives commented on the difficulty of finding suitably qualified minorities and women for the more technical jobs.

Recommendation 2: Those responsible for recruiting for State government in the four States should join together to develop a nationwide recruitment program to attract the best candidates, including as many minorities and women as possible, from the national pool. A regional effort would allow better recruitment at lower unit costs. The MIKN Selection Information Exchange might be augmented for this purpose.

Finding 3: Many minority and women's organizations noted that a major obstacle to the entry of their constituents into State service is lack of training. The Advisory Committees found that development of entry level roles with minimal qualifications, upward mobility programs, and career ladder patterns remains minimal in most agencies.

Recommendation 3a: The four States' personnel agencies should pursue far more vigorously their own stated recommendations for alleviating this problem.

Recommendation 3b: The Governors should give their personnel agencies authority to establish entry level posts and career ladders in every State agency, absent a very compelling need for specific minimal skills. For such occasions, State funds should be used to provide training needed for low-level State employees to qualify for promotional transfers into such higher skilled entry level posts.

Community Involvement

Finding: Differences in perceptions between community leaders and State officials suggest that, whatever the real problems, there is lack of trust that affirmative action programs are intended to recruit, promote, and retain qualified women and minorities. Part of the reason for this problem is the failure of government to involve minority groups and women in the planning and implementation of affirmative action programs.

Recommendation 1: The Governors should establish State citizen councils and State employee councils to develop, advise, and assist in the affirmative action program. These should include representatives of all racial, sex, and ethnic groups.

Recommendation 2: The Governor should require that each State agency, through appropriation from the State legislature, devote a portion of its funds and resources to the affirmative action program's community relations component. This portion should be sufficient so that within a short period of time there is both better understanding between community and State and a common view of what has been done and what remains to be done.

State Executive Orders

Finding: In Kansas, Missouri, and Iowa executive orders require affirmative action plans.

Recommendation 1: The Governor of Nebraska should order a comprehensive affirmative action plan for all State agencies.

Recommendation 2: All Governors should ensure that their executive orders cover all persons on the State payroll, irrespective of classification or size of agency, unless exclusion serves a public policy purpose sufficient to override the need for equal opportunity.

The Federal Role

Finding: Part of the responsibility for the failure of affirmative action rests with Federal authorities who have not required sufficient efforts in the States. Standards have been weak or nonexistent. Enforcement of standards has been even weaker or nonexistent.

Recommendation: The Commission is requested to urge Presidential action to implement the reorganization of civil rights compliance proposed in Volume V of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' report, *The Federal Civil Rights Enforcement Effort—1974*.

Appendix A

Race and Sex Composition of State Agencies (by Occupational Class, by Salary Level, and Agencywide)

The data on all the larger agencies and some smaller agencies are in the following tables. Most agencies with fewer than 25 employees have been aggregated under the heading of "minor agencies" except in Missouri, where reorganization has eliminated such units.

The numbers representing percentages in the tables have been rounded to hundredths of a percent, but have been printed without decimal points. Therefore, a figure XXXX in a percent column should be read as XX.XX percent. The percentages indicate not the percent of employees in the job type or salary level but the percentage of the agency's work force as a whole.

The data for these tables were supplied by the Iowa Office of the Comptroller, the Kansas Department of Administration, the Missouri Office of Administration, and the Nebraska Department of Personnel. Where an individual agency studied provided statistics on its work force that differed from those provided by its State's central personnel administration agency, the individual agency's figures were entered on the tables. Kansas' Equal Opportunity Office submitted figures for that State's agencies that were in some respects different from those supplied by the Kansas Department of Administration. Where these differences occurred, the equal opportunity office's figures were entered on the tables (except for agencies which supplied data on themselves).

Corrections to data in this appendix were received after the tables in the text of this report had been computed. Therefore, there may be slight discrepancies between figures in text tables and figures the reader might compute from this appendix as corrected. These discrepancies are not of significant magnitude.

IOWA
Agencywide

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	4	2353	1	588	11	6471	1	588
Ag Com	212	6974	5	164	82	2697	5	164
Atty Gen	52	6190	4	476	28	3333	0	0
Auditor	95	8051	0	0	21	1780	2	169
Banking	86	9451	0	0	5	549	0	0
Beer Liquor	480	7196	12	180	175	2624	0	0
Blind Com	57	5377	1	94	47	4434	1	94
Civil Rights	5	2500	3	1500	5	2500	7	3500
Commerce Com	66	7174	0	0	25	2717	1	109
Comptrollers Ofc	80	4969	8	497	71	4410	2	124
Conservation Com	422	9036	0	0	44	942	1	21
Crime Com	14	4828	0	0	14	4828	1	345
Development Com	28	8000	0	0	7	2000	0	0
Drug Abuse	5	3846	0	0	8	6154	0	0
Employ Sec	421	4427	13	137	487	5121	30	315
Environ Qual	1	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	78	6393	3	246	40	3279	1	82
Gen Services I	193	6206	22	707	83	2669	13	418
Gen Services II	60	7895	0	0	15	1974	1	132
Geological Survey	25	8333	0	0	5	1667	0	0
Govs Staff	4	2353	2	1176	10	5882	1	588
Health	80	3175	3	119	167	6627	2	79
History	18	4286	2	476	20	4762	2	476
Indust Com	6	3750	0	0	9	5625	1	625
Insurance	36	6000	2	333	22	3667	0	0
Labor	39	6393	2	328	16	2623	4	656
Law Enf Academy	7	5000	1	714	6	4286	0	0
Legislature	28	4444	2	317	33	5238	0	0
Library Com	11	2558	1	233	30	6977	1	233
Medical Examiners	1	3333	0	0	2	6667	0	0
Merit Employ	16	3636	0	0	27	6136	1	227
Natural Res	19	7308	0	0	7	2692	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	11	10000	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	6	6667	0	0	3	3333	0	0
Plan And Program	43	6232	2	290	23	3333	1	145
Pub Def	118	8551	3	217	17	1232	0	0
Employ Relations	9	6429	0	0	5	3571	0	0
Pub Instruction	436	4786	7	77	452	4962	16	176
Pub Safety	645	8589	3	40	97	1292	6	80
Regents	7	5000	0	0	7	5000	0	0
Revenue	292	5026	2	34	275	4733	12	207
Sec Of St	1	400	0	0	24	9600	0	0
Soc Services	2481	3482	81	114	4483	6291	81	114
Soil Cons	56	3522	0	0	103	6478	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	2	10000	0	0
Sup Ct	11	5500	0	0	9	4500	0	0
Transportation	3566	8476	37	88	586	1393	18	43
Treasurer	2	1176	0	0	14	8235	1	588
Watchmaking Examiner	1	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	39	3980	3	306	53	5408	3	306

IOWA
Salary Levels

	Less than $8,000							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	4	2353	1	588
Ag Com	4	132	4	132	53	1743	3	99
Atty Gen	1	119	0	0	14	1667	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	17	1441	1	85
Banking	0	0	0	0	3	330	0	0
Beer Liquor	237	3553	7	105	136	2039	0	0
Blind Com	23	2170	1	94	24	2264	1	94
Civil Rights	1	500	1	500	4	2000	4	2000
Commerce Com	2	217	0	0	18	1957	1	109
Comptrollers Ofc	6	373	3	186	47	2919	2	124
Conservation Com	40	857	0	0	30	642	1	21
Crime Com	0	0	0	0	5	1724	1	345
Development Com	1	286	0	0	3	857	0	0
Drug Abuse	0	0	0	0	4	3077	0	0
Employ Sec	13	137	1	11	243	2555	16	168
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	1	82	0	0	26	2131	1	82
Gen Services I	108	3473	19	611	66	2122	12	386
Gen Services II	1	132	0	0	8	1053	0	0
Geological Survey	2	667	0	0	3	1000	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	1	588	6	3529	0	0
Health	3	119	1	40	85	3373	1	40
History	7	1667	1	238	11	2619	2	476
Indust Com	0	0	0	0	7	4375	1	625
Insurance	0	0	0	0	15	2500	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	9	1475	3	492
Law Enf Academy	0	0	0	0	5	3571	0	0
Legislature	0	0	1	159	9	1429	0	0
Library Com	7	1628	0	0	17	3953	1	233
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	1	3333	0	0
Merit Employ	0	0	0	0	18	4091	1	227
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	6	2308	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	6	5455	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	0	0	0	0	2	2222	0	0
Plan And Program	0	0	0	0	10	1449	0	0
Pub Def	28	2029	1	72	10	725	0	0
Employ Relations	1	714	0	0	3	2143	0	0
Pub Instruction	40	440	2	22	251	2755	12	132
Pub Safety	24	320	0	0	57	759	2	27
Regents	0	0	0	0	5	3571	0	0
Revenue	12	207	1	17	221	3804	10	172
Sec Of St	1	400	0	0	17	6800	0	0
Soc Services	667	936	30	42	2797	3925	49	69
Soil Cons	23	1447	0	0	101	6352	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	1	500	0	0	7	3500	0	0
Transportation	541	1286	11	26	459	1091	16	38
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	7	4118	1	588
Watchmaking Examiner	1	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	5	510	0	0	33	3367	1	102

IOWA
Salary Levels (cont.)

	$8,000 to $16,000							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	4	2353	1	588	7	4118	0	0
Ag Com	181	5954	0	0	29	954	2	66
Atty Gen	21	2500	2	238	11	1310	0	0
Auditor	95	8051	0	0	4	339	1	85
Banking	58	6374	0	0	2	220	0	0
Beer Liquor	241	3613	5	75	39	585	0	0
Blind Com	28	2642	0	0	21	1981	0	0
Civil Rights	4	2000	2	1000	1	500	3	1500
Commerce Com	39	4239	0	0	7	761	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	51	3168	4	248	24	1491	0	0
Conservation Com	364	7794	0	0	14	300	0	0
Crime Com	11	3793	0	0	9	3103	0	0
Development Com	19	5429	0	0	4	1143	0	0
Drug Abuse	3	2308	0	0	4	3077	0	0
Employ Sec	362	3807	11	116	239	2513	14	147
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	55	4508	3	246	14	1148	0	0
Gen Services I	76	2444	3	96	17	547	1	32
Gen Services II	52	6842	0	0	7	921	1	132
Geological Survey	19	6333	0	0	2	667	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	1	588	4	2353	1	588
Health	57	2262	2	79	78	3095	1	40
History	9	2143	1	238	9	2143	0	0
Indust Com	2	1250	0	0	2	1250	0	0
Insurance	21	3500	2	333	6	1000	0	0
Labor	34	5574	1	164	7	1148	1	164
Law Enf Academy	3	2143	1	714	1	714	0	0
Legislature	18	2857	1	159	23	3651	0	0
Library Com	3	698	1	233	13	3023	0	0
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	1	3333	0	0
Merit Employ	11	2500	0	0	9	2045	0	0
Natural Res	14	5385	0	0	1	385	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	4	3636	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	5	5556	0	0	1	1111	0	0
Plan And Program	27	3913	2	290	12	1739	1	145
Pub Def	84	6087	2	145	7	507	0	0
Employ Relations	4	2857	0	0	2	1429	0	0
Pub Instruction	228	2503	2	22	180	1976	4	44
Pub Safety	598	7963	3	40	39	519	4	53
Regents	1	714	0	0	2	1429	0	0
Revenue	259	4458	1	17	53	912	2	34
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	7	2800	0	0
Soc Services	1605	2252	28	39	1655	2322	29	41
Soil Cons	30	1887	0	0	2	126	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	2	10000	0	0
Sup Ct	10	5000	0	0	2	1000	0	0
Transportation	2789	6629	19	45	126	300	1	2
Treasurer	1	588	0	0	7	4118	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	25	2551	3	306	18	1837	2	204

IOWA
Salary Levels (cont.)

	Greater than $16,000							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ag Com	27	888	1	33	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	30	3571	2	238	3	357	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	28	3077	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer Liquor	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blind Com	6	566	0	0	2	189	0	0
Civil Rights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce Com	25	2717	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	23	1429	1	62	0	0	0	0
Conservation Com	18	385	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crime Com	3	1034	0	0	0	0	0	0
Development Com	8	2286	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse	2	1538	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Sec	46	484	1	11	5	53	0	0
Environ Qual	1	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	22	1803	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services I	9	289	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services II	7	921	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geological Survey	4	1333	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Staff	4	2353	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	20	794	0	0	4	159	0	0
History	2	476	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indust Com	4	2500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	15	2500	0	0	1	167	0	0
Labor	5	820	1	164	0	0	0	0
Law Enf Academy	4	2857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislature	10	1587	0	0	1	159	0	0
Library Com	1	233	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Examiners	1	3333	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	5	1136	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	5	1923	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	1	909	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	1	1111	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	16	2319	0	0	1	145	0	0
Pub Def	6	435	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Relations	4	2857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Instruction	168	1844	2	22	21	231	0	0
Pub Safety	23	306	0	0	1	13	0	0
Regents	6	4286	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	21	361	0	0	1	17	0	0
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc Services	209	293	23	32	31	44	3	4
Soil Cons	3	189	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	236	561	7	17	1	2	1	2
Treasurer	1	588	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	9	918	0	0	2	204	0	0

IOWA
Occupations

ADMINISTRATORS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	1	568	0	0
Ag Com	6	197	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	43	5119	3	357	6	714	0	0
Auditor	1	85	0	0	1	85	0	0
Banking	7	769	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer Liquor	6	90	0	0	1	15	0	0
Blind Com	25	2358	0	0	6	566	0	0
Civil Rights	0	0	1	500	0	0	1	500
Commerce Com	10	1087	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	16	994	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation Com	13	278	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crime Com	7	2414	0	0	5	1724	0	0
Development Com	9	2571	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse	2	1538	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Sec	22	231	0	0	1	11	0	0
Environ Qual	1	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	8	656	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services I	10	322	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services II	9	1184	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geological Survey	2	667	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Staff	2	1176	1	588	0	0	0	0
Health	11	437	0	0	2	79	0	0
History	3	714	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indust Com	5	3125	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	5	833	0	0	1	167	0	0
Labor	2	328	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enf Academy	2	1429	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislature	7	1111	0	0	1	159	0	0
Library Com	1	233	0	0	1	233	0	0
Medical Examiners	1	3333	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	3	682	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	2	769	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	1	909	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	1	1111	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	16	2319	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Def	7	507	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Relations	4	2857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Instruction	114	1251	3	33	18	196	2	22
Pub Safety	20	266	0	0	0	0	0	0
Regents	5	3571	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	12	207	0	0	1	17	0	0
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	1	400	0	0
Soc Services	134	188	4	6	53	74	1	1
Soil Cons	2	126	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	1	5000	0	0
Sup Ct	1	500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	58	138	0	0	1	2	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	1	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	17	1735	2	204	6	612	0	0

IOWA
Occupations (cont.)

	PROFESSIONALS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	4	2353	1	588	2	1176	0	0
Ag Com	42	1382	1	33	9	296	1	33
Atty Gen	2	238	0	0	1	119	0	0
Auditor	94	7966	0	0	1	85	1	85
Banking	78	8571	0	0	1	110	0	0
Beer Liquor	5	75	0	0	3	45	0	0
Blind Com	20	1887	0	0	11	1038	0	0
Civil Rights	3	1500	0	0	0	0	1	500
Commerce Com	31	3370	0	0	1	109	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	30	1863	1	62	2	124	0	0
Conservation Com	106	2270	0	0	1	21	0	0
Crime Com	6	2069	0	0	2	690	0	0
Development Com	17	4857	0	0	1	286	0	0
Drug Abuse	3	2308	0	0	2	1538	0	0
Employ Sec	329	3460	9	95	128	1346	9	95
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	60	4918	3	246	6	492	0	0
Gen Services I	11	354	0	0	4	129	0	0
Gen Services II	10	1316	0	0	5	658	1	132
Geological Survey	17	5667	0	0	1	333	0	0
Govs Staff	2	1176	0	0	1	588	1	588
Health	36	1429	1	40	61	2421	0	0
History	4	952	1	238	5	1190	0	0
Indust Com	1	625	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	30	5000	2	333	2	333	0	0
Labor	11	1803	2	328	2	328	0	0
Law Enf Academy	3	2143	1	714	0	0	0	0
Legislature	13	2063	1	159	5	794	0	0
Library Com	3	698	0	0	6	1395	0	0
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	10	2273	0	0	2	455	0	0
Natural Res	14	5385	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	3	2727	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	4	4444	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	27	3913	2	290	8	1159	1	145
Pub Def	11	797	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Relations	4	2857	0	0	1	714	0	0
Pub Instruction	269	2953	2	22	99	1087	2	22
Pub Safety	47	626	0	0	8	107	1	13
Regents	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	148	2547	0	0	6	103	0	0
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc Services	777	1090	33	46	940	1319	15	21
Soil Cons	3	189	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	9	4500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	367	872	10	24	4	10	1	2
Treasurer	2	1176	0	0	1	588	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	16	1633	1	102	6	612	2	204

IOWA
Occupations (cont.)

	SKILLED CRAFTS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ag Com	0	0	1	33	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer Liquor	6	90	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blind Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civil Rights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation Com	5	107	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crime Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Development Com	0	0	0	0	1	286	0	0
Drug Abuse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Sec	1	11	0	0	4	42	0	0
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services I	41	1318	0	0	14	450	4	129
Gen Services II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geological Survey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	1	40	0	0
History	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indust Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enf Academy	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislature	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	0	0	0	0	1	227	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Def	30	2174	2	145	0	0	0	0
Employ Relations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Instruction	2	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Safety	2	27	0	0	0	0	1	13
Regents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc Services	345	484	1	1	118	166	3	4
Soil Cons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	594	1412	0	0	6	14	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

IOWA
Occupations (cont.)

	TECHNICIANS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	1	588	0	0
Ag Com	158	5197	1	33	18	592	1	33
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer Liquor	11	165	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blind Com	3	283	0	0	3	283	0	0
Civil Rights	1	500	2	1000	0	0	1	500
Commerce Com	22	2391	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	32	1988	5	311	16	994	0	0
Conservation Com	78	1670	0	0	2	43	0	0
Crime Com	1	345	0	0	1	345	0	0
Development Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse	0	0	0	0	1	769	0	0
Employ Sec	56	589	3	32	81	852	4	42
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	9	738	0	0	5	410	0	0
Gen Services I	4	129	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services II	33	4342	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geological Survey	3	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	28	1111	1	40	7	278	0	0
History	2	476	0	0	4	952	0	0
Indust Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	26	4262	0	0	1	164	1	164
Law Enf Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislature	1	159	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library Com	2	465	0	0	7	1628	0	0
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	3	682	0	0	3	682	0	0
Natural Res	3	1154	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	1	1111	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Def	7	507	0	0	1	72	0	0
Employ Relations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Instruction	13	143	0	0	9	99	2	22
Pub Safety	151	2011	1	13	14	186	1	13
Regents	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	40	688	1	17	18	310	0	0
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc Services	75	105	2	3	203	285	3	4
Soil Cons	2	126	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	1087	2584	9	21	48	114	1	2
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	1	102	0	0	0	0	0	0

IOWA
Occupations (cont.)

	OFFICE/CLERICAL							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	4	2353	1	588
Ag Com	2	66	0	0	52	1711	3	99
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	18	2143	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	19	1610	1	85
Banking	1	110	0	0	4	440	0	0
Beer Liquor	410	6147	6	90	167	2504	0	0
Blind Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civil Rights	0	0	0	0	4	2000	3	1500
Commerce Com	0	0	0	0	22	2391	1	109
Comptrollers Ofc	2	124	2	124	53	3292	2	124
Conservation Com	1	21	0	0	35	749	1	21
Crime Com	0	0	0	0	5	1724	1	345
Development Com	2	571	0	0	4	1143	0	0
Drug Abuse	0	0	0	0	5	3846	0	0
Employ Sec	8	84	0	0	209	2198	10	105
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	1	82	0	0	27	2213	1	82
Gen Services I	10	322	7	225	31	997	1	32
Gen Services II	0	0	0	0	8	1053	0	0
Geological Survey	0	0	0	0	4	1333	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	1	588	9	5294	0	0
Health	5	198	1	40	94	3730	2	79
History	3	714	0	0	8	1905	1	238
Indust Com	0	0	0	0	9	5625	1	625
Insurance	0	0	0	0	18	3000	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	11	1803	3	492
Law Enf Academy	0	0	0	0	6	4286	0	0
Legislature	7	1111	1	159	27	4286	0	0
Library Com	2	465	1	233	11	2558	0	0
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	2	6667	0	0
Merit Employ	0	0	0	0	21	4773	1	227
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	7	2692	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	7	6364	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	0	0	0	0	3	3333	0	0
Plan And Program	0	0	0	0	13	1884	0	0
Pub Def	4	290	0	0	14	1014	0	0
Employ Relations	0	0	0	0	4	2857	0	0
Pub Instruction	8	89	0	0	290	3183	8	88
Pub Safety	13	173	0	0	65	866	2	27
Regents	0	0	0	0	7	5000	0	0
Revenue	16	275	0	0	240	4131	10	172
Sec Of St	1	400	0	0	23	9200	0	0
Soc Services	54	76	0	0	985	1382	19	27
Soil Cons	1	63	0	0	103	6478	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	1	5000	0	0
Sup Ct	1	500	0	0	9	4500	0	0
Transportation	70	166	1	2	483	1148	16	38
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	10	5882	1	588
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	2	204	0	0	38	3878	1	102

IOWA
Occupations (cont.)

	PARAPROFESSIONALS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	3	1765	0	0
Ag Com	2	66	0	0	1	33	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	1	119	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer Liquor	0	0	0	0	2	30	0	0
Blind Com	9	849	1	94	27	2547	1	94
Civil Rights	1	500	0	0	1	500	1	500
Commerce Com	3	326	0	0	2	217	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation Com	3	64	0	0	4	86	0	0
Crime Com	0	0	0	0	1	345	0	0
Development Com	0	0	0	0	1	286	0	0
Drug Abuse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Sec	5	53	1	11	64	673	6	63
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	2	164	0	0
Gen Services I	1	32	0	0	2	64	0	0
Gen Services II	8	1053	0	0	2	263	0	0
Geological Survey	3	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	2	79	0	0
History	0	0	0	0	1	238	0	0
Indust Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	1	167	0	0	1	167	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	2	328	0	0
Law Enf Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislature	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library Com	1	233	0	0	4	930	0	0
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	0	0	0	0	2	290	0	0
Pub Def	1	72	0	0	1	72	0	0
Employ Relations	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Instruction	14	154	0	0	29	318	2	22
Pub Safety	0	0	0	0	5	67	0	0
Regents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	75	1291	0	0	10	172	2	34
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc Services	469	658	22	31	1810	2540	33	46
Soil Cons	48	3019	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	229	544	3	7	38	90	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	3	1765	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	2	204	0	0	3	306	0	0

IOWA
Occupations (cont.)

	PROTECTIVE SERVICE							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ag Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	7	833	1	119	2	238	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blind Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civil Rights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation Com	124	2655	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crime Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Development Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Sec	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services I	25	804	0	0	1	32	0	0
Gen Services II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geological Survey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
History	4	952	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indust Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enf Academy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislature	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Def	41	2971	1	72	0	0	0	0
Employ Relations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Instruction	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0
Pub Safety	400	5326	2	27	4	53	1	13
Regents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc Services	414	581	14	20	32	45	0	0
Soil Cons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

IOWA
Occupations (cont.)

	MAINTENANCE							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Aging Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ag Com	2	66	2	66	2	66	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beer Liquor	42	630	6	90	2	30	0	0
Blind Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civil Rights	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Comptrollers Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservation Com	92	1970	0	0	2	43	0	0
Crime Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Development Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug Abuse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employ Sec	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11
Environ Qual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gen Services I	91	2926	15	482	31	997	8	257
Gen Services II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Geological Survey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
History	2	476	1	238	2	476	1	238
Indust Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enf Academy	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislature	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library Com	2	465	0	0	1	233	1	233
Medical Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Merit Employ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacy Examiners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plan And Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Def	17	1232	0	0	1	72	0	0
Employ Relations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Instruction	16	176	2	22	6	66	0	0
Pub Safety	12	160	0	0	1	13	0	0
Regents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	1	17	1	17	0	0	0	0
Sec Of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soc Services	213	299	5	7	342	480	7	10
Soil Cons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Com On Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	1161	2760	14	33	6	14	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watchmaking Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	1	102	0	0	0	0	0	0

KANSAS
Agencywide

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	34	5965	2	351	20	3509	1	175
Agriculture	204	6755	6	199	85	2815	7	232
Animal Health	22	6286	0	0	13	3714	0	0
Atty Gen	76	6129	3	242	42	3387	3	242
Bank Com	25	7353	1	294	8	2353	0	0
Corp Com	78	5342	1	68	62	4247	5	342
Correct Vocation Trn	60	6000	12	1200	21	2100	7	700
Crip Children	1	667	0	0	14	9333	0	0
Administration	405	5371	39	517	251	3329	59	782
Fire Marshall	17	7391	2	870	4	1739	0	0
Forest Fish Game	273	8558	1	31	45	1411	0	0
Govs Ofc	8	2759	1	345	17	5862	3	1034
Gov Com Criminal Adm	15	7143	0	0	6	2857	0	0
Grain Inspect	261	7654	17	499	61	1789	2	59
Health and Environ	7	4118	0	0	7	4118	3	1765
Transportation	3051	8687	147	418	303	863	11	31
Hiway Patrol	452	8659	10	192	59	1130	1	19
Historical Soc	50	5495	2	220	35	3846	4	440
Econ Dev	18	5806	0	0	13	4194	0	0
Correctional Inst	17	3469	1	204	24	4898	7	1429
Indust Reformatory	172	8113	9	425	29	1368	2	94
Topeka Youth	70	4142	51	3018	39	2308	9	533
Beloit Youth	18	2195	0	0	64	7805	0	0
Ins Dept	44	4000	0	0	63	5727	3	273
Atchison Youth	45	5233	6	698	33	3837	2	233
Neurological Inst	216	2762	53	678	369	4719	144	1841
Employee Retire	10	2128	2	426	35	7447	0	0
Larned St Hosp	282	3658	34	441	421	5460	34	441
Legis Research	10	5000	0	0	9	4500	1	500
Legis Ed Plan	6	2222	1	370	20	7407	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	307	3344	45	490	517	5632	49	534
Parks and Res	143	6384	6	268	74	3364	1	45
Parsons St Hosp	123	2847	10	231	276	6389	23	532
Corrections	104	6933	2	133	42	2800	2	133
State Pen	269	8127	20	604	41	1239	1	30
Post Audit	32	8000	0	0	8	2000	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	74	7551	10	1020	11	1122	3	306
Revenue	545	3890	21	150	780	5567	55	393
Statues Revisor	13	5652	1	435	9	3913	0	0
Norton St Hosp	167	4771	9	257	172	4914	2	57
Sch for Blind	20	8000	1	400	1	400	3	1200
Sch For Deaf	20	5714	0	0	15	4286	0	0
Sec of St	11	2444	1	222	30	6667	3	667
SRS	756	2603	79	272	1887	6498	182	627
Mental Health	16	4000	0	0	24	6000	0	0
Soldiers Home	34	2394	3	211	97	6831	8	563
Education	63	4200	0	0	82	5467	5	333
Professionals Bd	14	5000	0	0	14	5000	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	186	2601	110	1538	262	3664	157	2196
Treasurer	12	2727	1	227	30	6818	1	227
Judicial Dept	119	6879	2	116	52	3006	0	0
Water Res Bd	21	7500	0	0	7	2500	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	167	1906	32	365	594	6781	83	947
Human Res	477	4409	56	518	485	4482	64	591
Minor Agencies	65	4140	6	382	78	4960	8	510

KANSAS
Salary Levels

Less than $8,000

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	3	526	1	175	18	3158	1	175
Agriculture	10	331	2	66	67	2219	5	166
Animal Health	7	2000	0	0	13	3714	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	36	2903	2	161
Bank Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	2	137	1	68	59	4041	1	68
Correct Vocation Trn	0	0	2	200	14	1400	3	300
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	2	1333	0	0
Administration	161	2135	28	371	214	2838	51	676
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	52	1630	0	0	44	1379	0	0
Govs Ofc	4	1379	0	0	0	0	2	690
Gov Com Criminal Adm	0	0	0	0	5	2381	0	0
Grain Inspect	0	0	17	499	45	1320	1	29
Health and Environ	3	1765	0	0	2	1176	3	1765
Transportation	0	0	107	305	278	192	0	0
Hiway Patrol	5	96	1	19	50	958	1	19
Historical Soc	16	1758	2	220	27	2967	4	440
Econ Dev	1	323	0	0	10	3226	0	0
Correctional Inst	1	204	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indust Reformatory	1	47	0	0	20	943	1	47
Topeka Youth	6	355	4	237	25	1479	3	178
Beloit Youth	5	610	0	0	57	6951	0	0
Ins Dept	2	182	0	0	50	4545	3	273
Atchison Youth	33	3837	5	581	8	930	0	0
Neurological Inst	166	2123	50	639	310	3964	140	1790
Employee Retire	1	213	0	0	34	7234	0	0
Larned St Hosp	67	869	14	182	294	3813	15	195
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	2	741	1	370	13	4815	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	223	2429	34	370	436	4749	42	458
Parks and Res	78	3482	5	223	62	2768	1	45
Parsons St Hosp	47	1088	9	208	91	2106	10	231
Corrections	0	0	0	0	28	1867	2	133
State Pen	0	0	1	30	21	634	0	0
Post Audit	0	0	0	0	1	250	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	3	306	2	204	6	612	1	102
Revenue	52	371	3	21	612	4368	47	333
Statues Revisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norton St Hosp	134	3829	8	229	154	4400	1	29
Sch for Blind	6	2400	1	400	1	400	3	1200
Sch for Deaf	12	3429	0	0	15	4286	0	0
Sec of St	7	1556	0	0	10	2222	3	667
SRS	188	647	51	176	957	3295	119	410
Mental Health	0	0	0	0	17	4250	0	0
Soldiers Home	14	986	3	211	87	6127	8	563
Education	1	67	0	0	5	333	0	0
Professionals Bd	3	1071	0	0	11	3929	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	100	1399	45	629	122	1706	41	573
Treasurer	6	1364	1	227	26	5909	1	227
Judicial Dept	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Res Bd	5	1786	0	0	2	714	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	106	1210	25	285	501	5719	73	833
Human Res	27	250	19	176	311	2874	42	388
Minor Agencies	16	1019	0	0	28	1783	1	64

KANSAS
Salary Levels (cont.)

	$8,000 to $16,000							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	30	5263	0	0	2	351	0	0
Agriculture	132	4371	3	99	18	596	2	66
Animal Health	10	2857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	51	4113	2	161	6	484	1	81
Bank Com	24	7059	1	294	8	2353	0	0
Corp Com	49	3356	0	0	2	137	4	274
Correct Vocation Trn	58	5800	10	1000	6	600	4	400
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	12	8000	0	0
Administration	103	1366	11	146	33	438	7	93
Fire Marshall	17	7391	2	870	4	1739	0	0
Forest Fish Game	221	6928	1	31	1	31	0	0
Govs Ofc	4	1379	1	345	15	5172	0	0
Gov Com Criminal Adm	7	3333	0	0	1	476	0	0
Grain Inspect	259	7595	0	0	15	440	1	29
Health and Environ	1	588	0	0	3	1765	0	0
Transportation	2667	7594	34	97	24	68	11	31
Hiway Patrol	416	7969	9	172	9	172	0	0
Historical Soc	17	1868	0	0	8	879	0	0
Econ Dev	13	4194	0	0	3	968	0	0
Correctional Inst	16	3265	1	204	23	4694	7	1429
Indust Reformatory	169	7972	8	377	9	425	1	47
Topeka Youth	62	3669	44	2604	14	828	6	355
Beloit Youth	12	1463	0	0	7	854	0	0
Ins Dept	33	3000	0	0	13	1182	0	0
Atchison Youth	12	1395	1	116	25	2907	2	232
Neurological Inst	45	575	2	26	58	742	3	38
Employee Retire	6	1277	2	426	1	213	0	0
Larned St Hosp	208	2698	20	259	126	1634	19	246
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	9	4500	1	500
Legis Ed Plan	4	1481	0	0	6	2222	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	78	850	0	0	78	850	3	33
Parks and Res	56	2500	1	45	12	536	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	70	1620	1	23	183	4236	13	301
Corrections	103	6867	2	133	14	933	0	0
State Pen	265	8006	19	574	20	604	1	30
Post Audit	3	750	0	0	3	750	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	65	6633	6	612	5	510	2	204
Revenue	455	3248	18	128	168	1199	8	57
Statues Revisor	3	1304	1	435	5	2174	0	0
Norton St Hosp	33	943	1	29	18	514	1	29
Sch for Blind	13	5200	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Deaf	8	2286	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec of St	3	667	0	0	19	4222	0	0
SRS	505	1739	25	86	889	3061	57	196
Mental Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soldiers Home	18	1268	0	0	10	704	0	0
Education	3	200	0	0	54	3600	4	267
Professionals Bd	11	3929	0	0	2	714	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	76	1063	57	797	139	1944	114	1594
Treasurer	4	909	0	0	4	909	0	0
Judicial Dept	43	2486	1	58	50	2890	0	0
Water Res Bd	3	1071	0	0	4	1429	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	55	628	7	80	93	1062	7	80
Human Res	395	3651	37	342	174	1608	22	203
Minor Agencies	38	2420	3	191	49	3121	7	446

KANSAS
Salary Levels (cont.)

	Greater than $16,000							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	1	175	1	175	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	62	2053	1	33	0	0	0	0
Animal Health	5	1429	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	25	2016	1	81	0	0	0	0
Bank Com	1	294	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	27	1849	0	0	1	68	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	2	200	0	0	1	100	0	0
Crip Children	1	667	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration	141	1870	0	0	4	53	1	13
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	2	690	1	345
Gov Com Criminal Adm	8	3810	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grain Inspect	2	59	0	0	1	29	0	0
Health and Environ	3	1765	0	0	2	1176	0	0
Transportation	384	1093	6	17	1	3	0	0
Hiway Patrol	31	594	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	17	1868	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Dev	4	1290	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Inst	0	0	0	0	1	204	0	0
Indust Reformatory	2	94	1	47	0	0	0	0
Topeka Youth	2	118	3	178	0	0	0	0
Beloit Youth	1	122	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ins Dept	9	818	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison Youth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neurological Inst	5	64	1	13	1	13	1	13
Employee Retire	3	638	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larned St Hosp	7	91	0	0	1	13	0	0
Legis Research	10	5000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	0	0	0	0	1	370	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	6	65	11	120	3	33	4	44
Parks and Res	9	402	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	6	139	0	0	2	46	0	0
Corrections	1	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Pen	4	121	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post Audit	29	7250	0	0	4	1000	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	6	612	2	204	0	0	0	0
Revenue	38	271	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statues Revisor	10	4348	0	0	4	1739	0	0
Norton St Hosp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Blind	1	400	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Deaf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec of St	1	222	1	222	1	222	0	0
SRS	63	217	3	10	41	141	6	21
Mental Health	16	4000	0	0	7	1750	0	0
Soldiers Home	2	141	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	59	3933	0	0	23	1533	1	67
Professionals Bd	0	0	0	0	1	357	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	10	140	8	112	1	14	2	28
Treasurer	2	455	0	0	0	0	0	0
Judicial Dept	76	4393	1	58	2	116	0	0
Water Res Bd	13	4643	0	0	1	357	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	6	68	0	0	0	0	3	34
Human Res	55	508	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	11	701	3	191	1	64	0	0

KANSAS
Occupations

	ADMINISTRATORS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	4	702	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	18	647	0	0	0	0	0	0
Animal Health	2	571	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	2	215	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bank Com	1	278	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	7	547	0	0	1	68	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	2	182	1	91	0	0	0	0
Crip Children	1	526	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration	30	398	1	13	2	27	1	13
Fire Marshall	1	400	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	26	981	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov Com Criminal Adm	1	833	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grain Inspect	2	84	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health and Environ	21	477	0	0	21	477	1	23
Transportation	31	87	1	3	1	3	0	0
Hiway Patrol	4	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	2	220	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Dev	1	370	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Inst	1	182	0	0	1	182	0	0
Indust Reformatory	3	125	1	42	0	0	0	0
Topeka Youth	2	109	1	55	1	55	0	0
Beloit Youth	1	116	0	0	1	116	0	0
Ins Dept	9	818	0	0	1	91	0	0
Atchison Youth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neurological Inst	5	81	0	0	1	16	0	0
Employee Retire	3	638	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larned St Hosp	6	82	0	0	1	14	0	0
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	0	0	0	0	1	370	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	5	71	0	0	5	71	0	0
Parks and Res	1	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	4	95	0	0	2	48	0	0
Corrections	20	1389	1	69	0	0	0	0
State Pen	5	140	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post Audit	1	250	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	3	330	1	110	0	0	0	0
Revenue	25	172	1	7	0	0	0	0
Statues Revisor	4	1739	1	435	0	0	0	0
Norton St Hosp	3	115	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Blind	1	217	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Deaf	1	102	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec of St	1	222	0	0	1	222	0	0
SRS	57	173	5	15	42	127	6	18
Mental Health	7	1750	0	0	3	750	0	0
Soldiers Home	1	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	22	1467	0	0	4	267	0	0
Professionals Bd	1	357	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	5	75	0	0	5	75	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Judicial Dept	0	0	1	3	5	14	0	0
Water Res Bd	1	455	0	0	1	455	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	6	80	0	0	3	40	0	0
Human Res	57	562	9	89	8	79	1	10
Minor Agencies	15	955	1	64	4	255	0	0

KANSAS
Occupations (cont.)

	PROFESSIONALS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	10	1754	1	175	2	351	0	0
Agriculture	50	1799	1	6	4	144	0	0
Animal Health	3	857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	11	887	0	0	2	161	0	0
Bank Com	23	6389	1	78	3	838	0	0
Corp Com	18	1406	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	6	545	0	0	1	91	1	91
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	7	3684	0	0
Administration	110	1459	4	53	23	292	1	13
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	23	868	0	0	1	137	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov Com Criminal Adm	3	2500	0	0	1	833	0	0
Grain Inspect	0	0	0	0	1	41	0	0
Health and Environ	97	2205	1	123	61	1386	2	45
Transportation	349	984	7	21	6	17	0	0
Hiway Patrol	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	15	1648	0	0	8	879	0	0
Econ Dev	10	3704	0	0	4	1481	0	0
Correctional Inst	0	0	0	0	2	364	0	0
Indust Reformatory	10	417	0	0	5	208	2	83
Topeka Youth	13	710	2	110	12	656	1	55
Beloit Youth	3	349	0	0	4	465	0	0
Ins Dept	2	364	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison Youth	5	581	1	116	5	581	0	0
Neurological Inst	24	370	2	31	63	971	3	46
Employee Retire	6	1277	1	213	1	213	0	0
Larned St Hosp	32	437	4	56	59	806	1	14
Legis Research	3	1500	0	0	2	1000	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	4	1481	0	0	5	1852	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	33	466	1	14	68	960	8	56
Parks and Res	7	507	1	72	0	0	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	26	619	0	0	42	1000	2	48
Corrections	10	694	1	69	3	208	0	0
State Pen	13	365	0	0	2	56	0	0
Post Audit	31	7750	0	0	5	1250	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	10	1099	2	220	5	549	0	0
Revenue	74	510	1	7	5	34	0	0
Statues Revisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norton St Hosp	12	460	0	0	12	460	0	0
Sch for Blind	1	217	0	0	1	217	0	0
Sch for Deaf	2	204	0	0	1	102	0	0
Sec of St	3	667	1	222	3	667	0	0
SRS	496	1504	22	67	916	2778	55	167
Mental Health	10	2500	0	0	3	750	0	0
Soldiers Home	3	27	0	0	7	530	0	0
Education	37	2467	0	0	21	1400	1	67
Professionals Bd	0	0	0	0	2	714	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	27	358	1	15	31	1058	5	75
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Judicial Dept	62	169	1	3	370	1006	18	49
Water Res Bd	13	4643	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	17	227	3	40	42	561	5	67
Human Res	292	2886	26	256	147	1450	18	78
Minor Agencies	21	1338	5	318	8	510	1	64

KANSAS
Occupations (cont.)

	SKILLED CRAFTS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	2	351	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Animal Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bank Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	5	455	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration	130	1724	4	88	13	172	0	0
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	10	377	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	345
Gov Com Criminal Adm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grain Inspect	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health and Environ	5	114	0	0	0	0	1	588
Transportation	744	2097	23	65	1	3	0	0
Hiway Patrol	43	805	2	38	9	172	0	0
Historical Soc	13	1429	2	220	1	110	2	220
Econ Dev	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Inst	7	1273	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indust Reformatory	22	917	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka Youth	14	765	1	55	0	0	0	0
Beloit Youth	9	1047	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ins Dept	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison Youth	8	930	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neurological Inst	22	281	2	26	0	0	0	0
Employee Retire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larned St Hosp	35	478	2	27	1	13	0	0
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	37	523	0	0	1	14	0	0
Parks and Res	11	797	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	22	524	1	24	2	48	0	0
Corrections	5	347	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Pen	34	955	1	28	0	0	0	0
Post Audit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	3	330	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statues Revisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norton St Hosp	19	728	0	0	1	38	0	0
Sch for Blind	6	1304	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Deaf	6	612	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SRS	11	33	1	25	0	0	0	0
Mental Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soldiers Home	16	1212	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professionals Bd	9	3214	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	38	566	2	30	1	15	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Judicial Dept	273	742	13	35	18	49	2	5
Water Res Bd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	28	374	0	0	1	13	0	0
Human Res	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	4	255	0	0	0	0	0	0

KANSAS
Occupations (cont.)

	TECHNICIANS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	7	1228	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	118	4245	3	168	23	827	0	0
Animal Health	14	4000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	1	81	1	81	3	242	0	0
Bank Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	31	2422	0	0	3	234	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration	44	584	5	66	13	172	0	0
Fire Marshall	15	6000	2	800	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	81	3057	1	38	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov Com Criminal Adm	3	2500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grain Inspect	50	2049	2	82	3	133	0	0
Health and Environ	54	1227	0	0	30	455	0	0
Transportation	943	2658	37	104	21	59	2	6
Hiway Patrol	31	564	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	6	659	0	0	3	330	0	0
Econ Dev	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Inst	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indust Reformatory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka Youth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beloit Youth	0	0	0	0	1	116	0	0
Ins Dept	0	0	0	0	1	182	0	0
Atchison Youth	1	116	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neurological Inst	1	13	2	26	20	256	5	64
Employee Retire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larned St Hosp	2	27	0	0	7	96	2	26
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	8	113	0	0	19	268	0	0
Parks and Res	21	1522	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	8	190	0	0	6	143	0	0
Corrections	4	278	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Pen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post Audit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	330	2273	17	117	200	1377	8	55
Statues Revisor	5	2174	0	0	4	1739	0	0
Norton St Hosp	2	77	1	38	5	192	0	0
Sch for Blind	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Deaf	0	0	1	102	0	0	0	0
Sec of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SRS	15	45	5	15	543	1647	64	194
Mental Health	1	250	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soldiers Home	0	0	0	0	1	70	0	0
Education	1	67	0	0	1	67	0	0
Professionals Bd	0	0	0	0	1	357	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	4	60	0	0	13	194	3	45
Treasurer	4	1250	0	0	1	313	0	0
Judicial Dept	18	212	11	30	215	585	114	310
Water Res Bd	4	1429	0	0	1	357	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	2	27	2	27	6	80	3	40
Human Res	43	424	3	30	7	168	0	0
Minor Agencies	4	255	0	0	0	0	0	0

KANSAS
Occupations (cont.)

	OFFICE/CLERICAL							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	4	702	0	0	18	3158	1	175
Agriculture	2	72	2	78	50	1799	0	0
Animal Health	3	857	0	0	13	3714	0	0
Atty Gen	21	1694	1	81	36	2903	3	242
Bank Com	0	0	0	0	7	2059	0	0
Corp Com	8	625	1	78	54	4219	6	469
Correct Vocation Trn	1	91	0	0	8	727	0	0
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	9	4737	1	526
Administration	33	438	3	40	171	2268	8	106
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	3	1200	0	0
Forest Fish Game	2	75	0	0	41	1547	0	0
Govs Ofc	8	2759	1	345	15	5172	1	345
Gov Com Criminal Adm	0	0	0	0	4	3333	0	0
Grain Inspect	2	82	0	0	16	656	2	82
Health and Environ	7	159	2	45	134	3045	4	91
Transportation	61	172	4	11	280	789	12	34
Hiway Patrol	2	36	0	0	39	709	3	55
Historical Soc	9	989	0	0	20	2198	2	220
Econ Dev	1	69	0	0	11	108	0	0
Correctional Inst	0	0	0	0	3	545	0	0
Indust Reformatory	4	167	0	0	23	958	2	83
Topeka Youth	2	109	0	0	14	765	0	0
Beloit Youth	0	0	0	0	9	1047	0	0
Ins Dept	1	182	0	0	47	8545	3	545
Atchison Youth	3	349	1	116	7	814	0	0
Neurological Inst	8	102	1	13	32	409	3	38
Employee Retire	1	213	1	213	34	7234	0	0
Larned St Hosp	8	109	0	0	66	962	0	0
Legis Research	7	3500	0	0	7	3500	1	500
Legis Ed Plan	2	741	1	370	13	4815	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	8	113	0	0	80	1130	7	99
Parks and Res	4	290	0	0	9	652	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	7	167	0	0	44	1048	0	0
Corrections	1	69	0	0	30	2083	0	0
State Pen	15	421	0	0	25	702	1	30
Post Audit	0	0	0	0	3	750	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	3	380	0	0	5	549	1	110
Revenue	39	69	1	7	646	4449	50	344
Statues Revisor	1	435	0	0	5	2174	0	0
Norton St Hosp	2	77	0	0	20	766	0	0
Sch for Blind	0	0	0	0	5	1087	0	0
Sch for Deaf	1	102	0	0	9	918	0	0
Sec of St	7	1556	0	0	26	5778	3	667
SRS	29	88	4	12	723	2345	82	240
Mental Health	0	0	0	0	16	4000	0	0
Soldiers Home	1	76	0	0	3	227	0	0
Education	3	200	0	0	56	3733	4	267
Professionals Bd	1	357	0	0	11	3929	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	9	134	4	60	69	1028	16	232
Treasurer	1	313	1	313	17	5313	1	313
Judicial Dept	87	237	15	41	1103	2999	173	470
Water Res Bd	0	0	0	0	4	1429	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	4	53	0	0	42	561	1	13
Human Res	13	128	0	0	273	2458	24	231
Minor Agencies	14	892	0	0	66	4204	7	446

KANSAS
Occupations (cont.)

	PARAPROFESSIONALS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Animal Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bank Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	1	91	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	526
Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	0	0	0	0	1	31	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	2	690	1	345
Gov Com Criminal Adm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grain Inspect	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health and Environ	0	0	0	0	1	23	2	45
Transportation	1	3	0	0	1	3	1	3
Hiway Patrol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Dev	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Inst	0	0	1	182	1	182	0	0
Indust Reformatory	1	47	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka Youth	47	2568	38	2077	7	383	11	601
Beloit Youth	3	349	0	0	45	8182	0	0
Ins Dept	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison Youth	25	2907	3	349	14	1628	2	233
Neurological Inst	135	1726	29	371	227	2903	113	1445
Employee Retire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larned St Hosp	114	1557	15	205	202	2760	16	219
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	0	0	0	0	1	370	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	69	975	7	99	208	2895	20	282
Parks and Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	36	857	11	262	128	3048	13	310
Corrections	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Pen	4	112	7	56	3	84	0	0
Post Audit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statues Revisor	3	1304	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norton St Hosp	42	1609	1	38	82	3116	0	0
Sch for Blind	4	270	1	217	6	1304	0	0
Sch for Deaf	10	1020	1	102	21	2143	1	102
Sec of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SRS	12	36	5	15	25	76	15	45
Mental Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soldiers Home	3	227	1	76	50	3788	4	303
Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professionals Bd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	44	656	42	626	80	1192	88	1311
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Judicial Dept	61	3526	1	58	1	58	0	0
Water Res Bd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	44	588	10	134	353	4719	53	709
Human Res	18	178	7	69	9	89	4	39
Minor Agencies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

KANSAS
Occupations (cont.)

	PROTECTIVE SERVICE							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	3	526	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Animal Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	39	3145	1	81	1	81	0	0
Bank Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	51	4636	9	818	6	545	3	273
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire Marshall	4	1600	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov Com Criminal Adm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grain Inspect	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health and Environ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hiway Patrol	397	7218	8	145	4	36	0	0
Historical Soc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Dev	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Inst	7	1273	1	182	20	3636	7	1273
Indust Reformatory	144	5875	9	375	8	333	2	83
Topeka Youth	1	55	0	0	0	0	0	0
Beloit Youth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ins Dept	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison Youth	1	116	1	116	0	0	0	0
Neurological Inst	1	13	0	0	1	13	0	0
Employee Retire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larned St Hosp	18	246	1	14	0	0	0	0
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	23	251	3	33	3	33	2	22
Parks and Res	17	1232	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	5	119	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	54	3750	3	208	9	625	0	0
State Pen	204	5730	24	674	12	337	0	0
Post Audit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	47	5165	4	440	1	110	1	110
Revenue	25	178	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statues Revisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norton St Hosp	9	257	1	29	0	0	0	0
Sch for Blind	2	435	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sch for Deaf	2	204	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SRS	1	3	1	3	0	0	0	0
Mental Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soldiers Home	1	76	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professionals Bd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	10	149	1	15	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	3	938	0	0	1	313	0	0
Judicial Dept	62	1691	7	19	14	38	1	3
Water Res Bd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	4	53	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

KANSAS
Occupations (cont.)

	MAINTENANCE							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Adj Gen	4	702	1	175	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	1	36	1	36	0	0	0	0
Animal Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bank Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corp Com	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correct Vocation Trn	2	182	5	455	3	273	5	455
Crip Children	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration	37	491	33	438	23	305	66	875
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Fish Game	29	1094	0	0	1	38	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gov Com Criminal Adm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grain Inspect	140	5738	17	697	9	369	0	0
Health and Environ	5	114	0	0	2	45	0	0
Transportation	930	2621	78	220	15	42	0	0
Hiway Patrol	2	36	1	18	5	91	1	18
Historical Soc	5	549	0	0	3	330	0	0
Econ Dev	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Inst	1	182	0	0	1	182	2	364
Indust Reformatory	6	250	2	83	0	0	0	0
Topeka Youth	2	109	2	109	9	492	3	164
Beloit Youth	3	349	0	0	2	233	0	0
Ins Dept	1	182	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison Youth	2	233	0	0	7	814	0	0
Neurological Inst	19	243	18	230	26	332	19	243
Employee Retire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larned St Hosp	41	560	10	137	74	1011	14	191
Legis Research	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legis Ed Plan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osawatomie St Hosp	24	339	3	14	78	1045	8	113
Parks and Res	57	4130	3	217	7	507	0	0
Parsons St Hosp	11	262	0	0	36	857	0	0
Corrections	1	69	0	0	0	0	2	139
State Pen	7	197	4	112	0	0	0	0
Post Audit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recept and Diagnose	5	549	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	12	117	2	14	11	76	0	0
Statues Revisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norton St Hosp	15	575	1	38	32	1226	0	0
Sch for Blind	5	1087	0	0	9	1957	5	1087
Sch For Deaf	10	1020	0	0	32	3265	0	0
Sec of St	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SRS	59	179	12	36	35	106	5	15
Mental Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Soldiers Home	11	833	0	0	27	2045	3	227
Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professionals Bd	3	1071	0	0	0	0	0	0
Topeka St Hosp	33	492	44	656	23	343	36	537
Treasurer	1	313	0	0	2	625	0	0
Judicial Dept	231	644	115	313	179	487	18	49
Water Res Bd	4	1429	0	0	1	357	0	0
Winfield St Hosp	30	401	6	80	69	922	14	187
Human Res	20	197	8	79	4	39	3	30
Minor Agencies	7	446	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Agencywide*

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	19	3167	0	0	41	6833	0	0
Pub Safety	1503	8089	41	221	294	1582	20	108
Highways	6014	9401	141	220	236	369	6	9
Administration Off	225	5068	22	495	186	4189	11	248
Transportation	7	7778	0	0	2	2222	0	0
DOLIR	420	3825	47	428	494	4499	137	1248
Elemen Sec Ed	486	2972	56	343	989	6049	104	636
Conservation	567	8972	3	47	62	981	0	0
Consumer Affairs	353	5439	15	231	260	4006	21	324
Mental Health	2859	2838	611	607	4886	4851	1717	1705
Agriculture	228	7015	18	554	76	2338	3	92
Revenue	378	1538	28	114	1965	7998	86	350
Social Services	2847	3052	246	264	5126	5496	1108	1188
Govs Staff	7	2258	1	323	23	7419	0	0
Natural Res	388	7608	4	78	198	2304	0	0
St Louis Airport	2	6667	0	0	1	3333	0	0

*"Natural Res" row incorporates figures provided by the Department of Natural Resources.

MISSOURI
Salary Levels**

Less than $8,000

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	2	333	0	0	26	4333	0	0
Pub Safety	140	753	10	54	260	1399	14	73
Highways	2409	3766	86	134	160	250	5	8
Administration Off	83	1869	18	405	152	3423	9	203
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOLIR	51	464	6	55	196	1785	48	437
Elemen Sec Ed	60	367	27	165	681	4165	74	453
Conservation	112	1772	2	32	44	696	0	0
Consumer Affairs	13	200	4	62	188	2897	11	169
Mental Health	2010	1995	481	478	4017	3988	1542	1531
Agriculture	100	3077	6	185	67	2062	3	92
Revenue	93	379	12	49	1848	7521	81	330
Social Services	1089	1168	116	124	2566	2751	572	613
Govs Staff	1	323	1	323	10	3226	0	0
Natural Res	13	1940	0	0	8	1194	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	1	3333	0	0

**Salary data corrections submitted by Department of Natural Resources are not incorporated here because the department's gradations differed from those used here.

MISSOURI
Salary Levels (cont.)

$8,000 to $16,000

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	8	1333	0	0	14	2333	0	0
Pub Safety	1187	6389	31	167	34	183	6	32
Highways	3473	5429	54	84	76	119	1	2
Administration Off	121	2725	4	90	34	766	2	45
Transportation	3	3333	0	0	2	2222	0	0
DOLIR	345	3142	41	373	295	2687	89	817
Elemen Sec Ed	332	2031	26	159	303	1853	30	183
Conservation	396	6266	1	16	18	285	0	0
Consumer Affairs	235	3621	10	154	69	1063	10	154
Mental Health	728	723	58	58	847	841	158	157
Agriculture	119	3662	12	369	9	277	0	0
Revenue	255	1038	16	65	115	468	5	20
Social Services	1613	1729	122	131	2546	2730	533	571
Govs Staff	1	323	0	0	13	4194	0	0
Natural Res	40	5970	0	0	4	597	0	0
St Louis Airport	1	3333	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Salary Levels (cont.)

Greater than $16,000

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	9	1500	0	0	1	167	0	0
Pub Safety	176	947	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highways	132	206	1	2	0	0	0	0
Administration Off	21	473	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	4	4444	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dolir	24	219	0	0	3	27	0	0
Elemen Sec Ed	94	575	3	18	5	31	0	0
Conservation	59	934	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer Affairs	105	1618	1	15	3	46	0	0
Mental Health	121	120	72	71	22	22	17	17
Agriculture	9	277	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	30	122	0	0	2	8	0	0
Social Services	145	155	8	9	14	15	3	3
Govs Staff	5	1613	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	2	299	0	0	0	0	0	0
St Louis Airport	1	3333	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupations

ADMINISTRATORS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	4	667	0	0	1	167	0	0
Pub Safety	56	301	3	16	0	0	0	0
Highways	27	42	0	0	1	2	0	0
Administration Off	12	270	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	2	2222	0	0	1	1111	0	0
DOLIR	58	528	3	27	9	82	4	36
Elemen Sec Ed	88	538	2	12	11	67	0	0
Conservation	49	775	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer Affairs	42	647	0	0	2	31	0	0
Mental Health	179	178	31	31	105	104	19	19
Agriculture	15	462	0	0	1	31	0	0
Revenue	72	293	8	33	48	195	2	8
Social Services	365	391	24	26	530	568	110	118
Govs Staff	5	1613	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St Louis Airport	2	6667	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupations (cont.)

PROFESSIONALS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	11	1833	0	0	16	2667	0	0
Pub Safety	120	646	3	16	10	54	0	0
Highways	948	1482	12	19	4	6	0	0
Administration Off	96	2162	3	68	18	405	2	40
Transportation	5	5556	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOLIR	99	902	6	55	45	410	10	90
Elemen Sec Ed	329	2012	23	141	335	2049	32	190
Conservation	213	3370	1	16	3	47	0	0
Consumer Affairs	272	4191	11	169	47	724	9	130
Mental Health	536	532	114	113	920	913	179	170
Agriculture	33	1015	0	0	1	31	0	0
Revenue	161	655	6	24	29	118	1	4
Social Services	1375	1474	133	143	2161	2317	478	510
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	242	45	3	58	21	407	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupations (cont.)

SKILLED CRAFTS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Safety	17	91	0	0	2	11	1	5
Highways	3910	6112	102	159	1	2	0	0
Administration Off	16	360	1	23	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOLIR	6	55	2	18	0	0	0	0
Elemen Sec Ed	1	6	0	0	3	18	0	0
Conservation	43	680	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer Affairs	3	46	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health	306	304	7	7	19	19	9	9
Agriculture	10	308	3	92	5	154	0	0
Revenue	5	20	1	4	0	0	0	0
Social Services	143	153	1	1	9	10	0	0
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupations (cont.)

TECHNICIANS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	2	333	0	0	2	333	0	0
Pub Safety	436	2347	2	11	6	32	0	0
Highways	819	1280	10	16	3	5	0	0
Administration Off	21	473	0	0	6	135	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOLIR	247	2250	29	264	278	2532	65	592
Elemen Sec Ed	6	37	0	0	7	43	1	6
Conservation	29	459	1	16	1	16	0	0
Consumer Affairs	15	231	0	0	7	108	2	31
Mental Health	26	26	6	6	133	132	39	39
Agriculture	87	2677	1	31	21	646	0	0
Revenue	39	159	3	12	53	216	2	8
Social Services	102	109	4	4	264	283	22	24
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupational (cont.)

	OFFICE/CLERICAL							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	2	333	0	0	22	3667	0	0
Pub Safety	17	91	0	0	255	1372	11	59
Highways	253	395	9	14	225	352	6	9
Administration Off	22	495	0	0	150	3378	1	23
Transportation	0	0	0	0	1	1111	0	0
DOLIR	8	73	0	0	160	1457	29	264
Elemen Sec Ed	4	24	3	18	334	2043	18	110
Conservation	12	190	0	0	54	854	0	0
Consumer Affairs	8	123	4	62	204	3143	10	154
Mental Health	112	111	16	16	874	868	129	128
Agriculture	2	62	0	0	46	1415	3	92
Revenue	37	151	3	12	1776	7228	74	301
Social Services	124	133	12	13	1843	1976	378	405
Govs Staff	1	323	0	0	17	5484	0	0
Natural Res	5	98	0	0	83	1627	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	1	3333	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupations (cont.)

	PARAPROFESSIONALS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Safety	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0
Highways	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration Off	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOLIR	0	0	7	64	2	18	29	264
Elemen Sec Ed	18	110	8	49	215	1315	28	171
Conservation	112	1772	1	16	4	63	0	0
Consumer Affairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health	984	977	220	218	2113	2098	968	961
Agriculture	73	2246	13	400	2	62	0	0
Revenue	58	236	2	8	59	240	6	24
Social Services	72	77	13	14	152	163	84	90
Govs Staff	1	323	0	0	2	645	0	0
Natural Res	23	415	0	0	14	270	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupations (cont.)

PROTECTIVE SERVICE

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Safety	792	4263	29	156	16	86	5	27
Highways	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administration Off	18	405	3	68	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOLIR	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elemen Sec Ed	3	18	1	6	0	0	0	0
Conservation	99	1566	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer Affairs	11	169	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health	74	73	21	21	0	0	1	1
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social Services	481	516	27	29	34	36	9	10
Govs Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natural Res	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MISSOURI
Occupations (cont.)

MAINTENANCE

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Higher Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub Safety	65	350	4	22	4	22	3	16
Highways	57	89	8	13	2	3	0	0
Administration Off	40	901	15	338	12	270	8	180
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOLIR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elemen Sec Ed	37	226	19	116	84	514	25	153
Conservation	10	158	0	0	0	0	0	0
Consumer Affairs	2	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health	642	637	196	195	722	717	373	370
Agriculture	8	246	1	31	0	0	0	0
Revenue	6	24	5	20	0	0	1	4
Social Services	185	198	32	34	133	143	27	29
Govs Staff	0	0	1	323	4	1290	0	0
Natural Res	118	2313	1	20	0	0	0	0
St Louis Airport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Agencywide

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	22	4400	0	0	28	5600	0	0
Sup Ct	86	4279	1	50	114	5672	0	0
Dist Ct	9	10000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	2	2857	0	0	5	7143	0	0
Sec Of State	5	5000	0	0	5	5000	0	0
Auditor	33	8462	0	0	6	1538	0	0
Atty Gen	5	5000	0	0	5	5000	0	0
Treasurer	2	2500	0	0	6	7500	0	0
Education	301	4019	9	120	427	5700	12	160
Revenue	148	5286	5	179	122	4357	5	179
Aeronautics	15	6818	0	0	7	3182	0	0
Agriculture	93	6691	0	0	44	3165	2	144
Banking	30	8333	0	0	6	1667	0	0
Health	90	3629	3	121	150	6048	5	202
Fire Marshall	10	7143	0	0	3	2143	1	714
Insurance	24	6154	0	0	15	3846	0	0
Labor	206	4758	24	554	174	4018	29	670
Motor Vehicles	76	3725	1	49	123	6029	4	196
Minor Agencies	855	3123	25	91	1829	6680	29	106
Welfare	94	3369	5	179	171	6129	6	215
Roads	139	9720	3	210	1	70	0	0
Military	20	5405	1	270	16	4324	0	0
Game And Parks	255	8199	6	193	49	1576	1	32
Liquor	16	5926	0	0	11	4074	0	0
Workmens Comp	5	3333	0	0	10	6667	0	0
Brand Committee	50	9259	0	0	4	741	0	0
Corrections	361	6710	27	502	143	2658	7	130
Ed TV	33	7674	0	0	9	2093	1	233
Historical Soc	21	5526	0	0	17	4474	0	0
Jt Merit	1	2000	0	0	4	8000	0	0
State Patrol	387	9085	3	70	36	845	0	0
Adm Services	169	6213	6	221	93	3419	4	147
E O C	1	833	5	4167	4	3333	2	1667
Tech Assist	17	9444	1	556	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	26	5417	2	417	19	3958	1	208
Law Enforc	20	6250	0	0	12	3750	0	0
Personnel	7	4667	1	667	7	4667	0	0
Environ Control	42	7241	0	0	16	2759	0	0
Employee Rete	3	2143	0	0	11	7857	0	0

NEBRASKA
Salary Levels

Less than $8,000

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	2	400	0	0	19	3800	0	0
Sup Ct	15	746	0	0	80	3980	0	0
Dist Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	4	5714	0	0
Sec Of State	0	0	0	0	4	4000	0	0
Auditor	1	256	0	0	2	513	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	1	1000	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	3	3750	0	0
Education	13	359	0	0	111	3060	3	83
Revenue	15	536	0	0	102	3643	4	143
Aeronautics	0	0	0	0	6	2727	0	0
Agriculture	17	1223	0	0	37	2662	2	144
Banking	0	0	0	0	5	1389	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	103	4153	4	161
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	2	1429	1	714
Insurance	1	256	0	0	13	3333	0	
Labor	6	139	1	23	80	1848	6	139
Motor Vehicles	22	1078	0	0	117	5735	4	196
Minor Agencies	572	2089	21	77	1512	5522	21	77
Welfare	7	255	0	0	95	3467	1	36
Roads	2	140	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	5	1351	1	270	16	4324	0	0
Game And Parks	49	1576	1	32	37	1190	1	32
Liquor	0	0	0	0	10	3704	0	0
Workmens Comp	2	1333	0	0	9	6000	0	0
Brand Committee	10	1852	0	0	3	556	0	0
Corrections	81	1506	7	130	102	1896	6	112
Ed TV	2	465	0	0	5	1163	1	233
Historical Soc	2	526	0	0	13	3421	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	3	6000	0	0
State Patrol	34	798	0	0	34	798	0	0
Adm Services	53	1949	3	110	69	2537	4	147
E O C	1	833	0	0	3	2500	0	0
Tech Assist	10	5556	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	2	417	0	0	13	2708	1	208
Law Enforc	0	0	0	0	10	3125	0	0
Personnel	0	0	0	0	3	2000	0	0
Environ Control	1	172	0	0	14	2414	0	0
Employee Rete	0	0	0	0	11	7857	0	0

NEBRASKA
Salary Levels

	$8,000 to $16,000							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	10	2000	0	0	9	1800	0	0
Sup Ct	29	1443	1	50	34	1692	0	0
Dist Ct	4	4444	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	1	1429	0	0
Sec Of State	4	4000	0	0	1	1000	0	0
Auditor	31	7949	0	0	4	1026	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	4	4000	0	0
Treasurer	1	1250	0	0	2	2500	0	0
Education	125	3453	6	166	81	2238	1	28
Revenue	118	4214	5	179	20	714	1	36
Aeronautics	14	6364	0	0	1	455	0	0
Agriculture	70	5036	0	0	7	504	0	0
Banking	23	6389	0	0	1	278	0	0
Health	75	3024	3	121	46	1855	1	40
Fire Marshall	10	7143	0	0	1	714	0	0
Insurance	18	4615	0	0	2	513	0	0
Labor	187	4319	23	531	94	2171	23	531
Motor Vehicles	52	2549	1	49	6	294	0	0
Minor Agencies	211	771	4	15	273	997	6	22
Welfare	75	2737	5	182	70	2555	3	109
Roads	127	8881	3	210	1	70	0	0
Military	13	3514	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	201	6463	4	129	12	386	0	0
Liquor	16	5926	0	0	1	370	0	0
Workmens Comp	1	667	0	0	1	667	0	0
Brand Committee	40	7407	0	0	1	185	0	0
Corrections	273	5074	20	372	39	725	1	19
Ed TV	30	6977	0	0	4	930	0	0
Historical Soc	18	4737	0	0	4	1053	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	1	2000	0	0
State Patrol	345	8099	3	70	2	47	0	0
Adm Services	96	3529	2	74	23	846	0	0
E O C	0	0	5	4167	1	833	2	1667
Tech Assist	1	556	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	21	4375	1	208	6	1250	0	0
Law Enforc	19	5930	0	0	2	625	0	0
Personnel	5	3333	1	667	4	2667	0	0
Environ Control	33	5690	0	0	2	345	0	0
Employee Rete	2	1429	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Salary Levels (cont.)

	Greater than $16,000							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	10	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	42	2090	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist Ct	5	5556	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	2	2857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of State	1	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	1	256	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	5	5000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	1	1250	0	0	1	1250	0	0
Education	21	580	0	0	1	28	0	0
Revenue	15	536	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aeronautics	1	455	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	6	432	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	7	1944	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	15	605	0	0	1	40	0	0
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	5	1282	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	13	300	0	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Vehicles	2	98	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	72	263	0	0	44	161	2	7
Welfare	12	438	0	0	6	219	0	0
Roads	10	699	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	2	541	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	5	161	1	32	0	0	0	0
Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workmens Comp	2	1333	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brand Committee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	7	130	0	0	2	37	0	0
Ed TV	1	233	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	1	263	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jt Merit	1	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Patrol	8	188	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adm Services	20	735	1	37	1	37	0	0
E O C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tech Assist	6	3333	1	556	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	3	625	1	208	0	0	0	0
Law Enforc	1	313	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel	2	1333	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Control	8	1379	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Rete	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations

ADMINISTRATORS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	3	600	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	37	1841	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist Ct	5	5556	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	1	1429	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of State	1	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	29	7436	0	0	1	256	0	0
Atty Gen	2	2000	0	0	1	1000	0	0
Treasurer	2	2500	0	0	2	2500	0	0
Education	47	628	1	13	9	120	1	13
Revenue	16	571	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aeronautics	1	455	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	6	432	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	20	5556	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	20	806	0	0	7	282	0	0
Fire Marshall	5	3571	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	14	3590	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	10	231	0	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Vehicles	7	343	0	0	5	245	0	0
Minor Agencies	49	179	0	0	7	26	1	4
Welfare	13	466	5	179	4	143	0	0
Roads	29	2028	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	52	1672	1	32	2	64	0	0
Liquor	3	1111	0	0	1	370	0	0
Workmens Comp	3	2000	0	0	1	667	0	0
Brand Committee	0	0	0	0	1	185	0	0
Corrections	34	632	1	19	3	56	0	0
Ed TV	1	233	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	5	1316	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jt Merit	1	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Patrol	2	47	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adm Services	23	846	2	74	4	147	0	0
E O C	0	0	2	1667	0	0	0	0
Tech Assist	1	556	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	7	1458	1	208	1	208	0	0
Law Enforc	3	938	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel	1	667	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Control	4	690	0	0	1	172	0	0
Employee Rete	2	1429	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations

PROFESSIONALS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	13	2600	0	0	1	200	0	0
Sup Ct	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist Ct	2	2222	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	1	1429	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of State	2	2000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	4	1026	0	0	3	769	0	0
Atty Gen	3	3000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	167	2230	7	93	154	2056	1	13
Revenue	98	3500	4	143	13	464	1	36
Aeronautics	6	2727	0	0	1	455	0	0
Agriculture	16	1151	0	0	4	288	0	0
Banking	10	2778	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	63	2540	3	121	37	1492	1	40
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	9	2308	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	181	4180	15	346	75	1732	16	370
Motor Vehicles	7	343	0	0	1	49	0	0
Minor Agencies	218	796	6	22	500	1826	8	29
Welfare	68	2437	3	108	59	2115	4	143
Roads	110	7692	3	210	1	70	0	0
Military	5	1351	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	61	1961	1	32	3	96	0	0
Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workmens Comp	2	1333	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brand Committee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	75	1394	4	74	34	632	1	19
Ed TV	11	2558	0	0	3	698	0	0
Historical Soc	11	2895	0	0	3	789	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	1	2000	0	0
State Patrol	7	164	0	0	1	23	0	0
Adm Services	43	1581	0	0	1	37	0	0
E O C	0	0	3	2500	2	1667	2	1667
Tech Assist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	16	3333	1	208	4	833	0	0
Law Enforc	14	4375	0	0	3	938	0	0
Personnel	5	3333	1	667	2	1333	0	0
Environ Control	17	2931	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Rete	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations (cont.)

	SKILLED CRAFTS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	11	147	0	0	4	53	0	0
Revenue	5	179	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aeronautics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	122	446	1	4	11	40	0	0
Welfare	1	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	4	1081	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	6	193	1	32	1	32	0	0
Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workmens Comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brand Committee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	25	465	2	37	1	19	0	0
Ed TV	1	233	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Patrol	2	47	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adm Services	19	699	1	37	1	37	0	0
E O C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tech Assist	2	1111	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	2	417	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enforc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Rete	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations (cont.)

	TECHNICIANS							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	1	200	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	2	27	0	0	5	67	0	0
Revenue	1	36	1	36	3	107	0	0
Aeronautics	5	2273	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	58	4173	0	0	8	576	1	72
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	5	202	0	0	4	161	0	0
Fire Marshall	1	714	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	4	92	0	0	1	23	0	0
Motor Vehicles	5	245	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	123	449	1	4	431	1574	4	15
Welfare	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	3	811	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	8	257	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liquor	5	1852	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workmens Comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brand Committee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	2	37	0	0	1	19	1	19
Ed TV	20	4651	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	2	526	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Patrol	43	1009	0	0	1	23	0	0
Adm Services	38	1397	1	37	7	257	0	0
E O C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tech Assist	0	0	1	556	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	1	208	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enforc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Control	21	3621	0	0	1	172	0	0
Employee Rete	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations (cont.)

	OFFICE/CLERICAL							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	37	1841	0	0	108	5373	0	0
Dist Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	4	5714	0	0
Sec Of State	2	2000	0	0	4	4000	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	2	513	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	3	3000	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	4	5000	0	0
Education	3	40	0	0	176	2350	3	40
Revenue	18	643	0	0	103	3679	4	143
Aeronautics	0	0	0	0	6	2727	0	0
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	26	1871	1	72
Banking	0	0	0	0	6	1667	0	0
Health	1	40	0	0	95	3831	2	81
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	3	2143	1	714
Insurance	1	256	0	0	14	3590	0	0
Labor	4	92	0	0	87	2009	3	69
Motor Vehicles	4	196	0	0	115	5637	4	196
Minor Agencies	13	47	0	0	234	855	2	7
Welfare	13	466	0	0	108	3871	1	36
Roads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	1	270	0	0	16	4324	0	0
Game And Parks	2	64	0	0	39	1254	1	32
Liquor	0	0	0	0	10	3704	0	0
Workmens Comp	0	0	0	0	9	6000	0	0
Brand Committee	0	0	0	0	3	556	0	0
Corrections	5	93	1	19	61	1134	1	19
Ed TV	0	0	0	0	6	1395	1	233
Historical Soc	0	0	0	0	13	3421	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	3	6000	0	0
State Patrol	2	47	0	0	24	563	0	0
Adm Services	14	515	0	0	67	2463	3	110
E O C	1	833	0	0	2	1667	0	0
Tech Assist	8	4444	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	0	0	0	0	10	2083	1	208
Law Enforc	0	0	0	0	9	2813	0	0
Personnel	1	667	0	0	5	3333	0	0
Environ Control	0	0	0	0	13	2241	0	0
Employee Rete	0	0	0	0	11	7857	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations (cont.)

PARAPROFESSIONALS

	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	3	600	0	0	1	200	0	0
Sup Ct	9	448	1	50	6	299	0	0
Dist Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	1	1429	0	0
Sec Of State	0	0	0	0	1	1000	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	1	1000	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	52	694	0	0	22	294	4	53
Revenue	4	143	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aeronautics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	3	216	0	0	3	216	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	1	40	0	0	2	81	1	40
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	1	256	0	0
Labor	4	92	8	185	11	254	10	231
Motor Vehicles	8	392	1	49	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	97	354	5	18	84	307	1	4
Welfare	5	182	0	0	13	474	1	36
Roads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	6	1622	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	31	997	0	0	2	64	0	0
Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workmens Comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brand Committee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	33	613	5	93	12	223	0	0
Ed TV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	0	0	0	0	1	263	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Patrol	9	211	0	0	9	211	0	0
Adm Services	5	184	0	0	5	184	0	0
E O C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tech Assist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	0	0	0	0	2	417	0	0
Law Enforc	1	313	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Control	0	0	0	0	1	172	0	0
Employee Rete	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations (cont.)

	PROTECTIVE SERVICE							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sup Ct	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist Ct	2	2222	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	3	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue	5	179	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aeronautics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	1	72	0	0	0	0	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fire Marshall	4	2857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Vehicles	38	1863	0	0	2	98	0	0
Minor Agencies	32	117	5	18	8	29	1	4
Welfare	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	47	1511	1	32	0	0	0	0
Liquor	8	2963	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workmens Comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brand Committee	49	9074	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	168	3123	14	260	17	316	4	74
Ed TV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Patrol	321	7535	3	70	1	23	0	0
Adm Services	3	110	0	0	0	0	0	0
E O C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tech Assist	6	3333	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enforc	2	625	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Rete	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEBRASKA
Occupations (cont.)

	MAINTENANCE							
	WM	WM%	MM	MM%	WF	WF%	MF	MF%
Legis Council	2	400	0	0	1	200	0	0
Sup Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dist Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govs Ofc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Of State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atty Gen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasurer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education	16	214	1	13	57	761	3	40
Revenue	1	36	0	0	3	107	0	0
Aeronautics	3	1364	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	9	647	0	0	3	216	0	0
Banking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	0	0	0	0	5	202	1	40
Fire Marshall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	3	69	1	23	0	0	0	0
Motor Vehicles	7	343	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Agencies	201	734	7	26	554	2023	12	44
Welfare	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roads	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military	1	270	1	270	0	0	0	0
Game And Parks	48	1543	2	64	2	64	0	0
Liquor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Workmens Comp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brand Committee	1	185	0	0	0	0	0	0
Corrections	19	353	0	0	14	260	0	0
Ed TV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Historical Soc	3	789	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jt Merit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Patrol	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adm Services	24	882	2	74	8	294	1	37
E O C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tech Assist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Econ Develop	0	0	0	0	2	417	0	0
Law Enforc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environ Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employee Rete	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix B

State and Agency Affirmative Action Plans Compared to a Model Plan

Appendix B consists of comparisons of a model affirmative action plan with the State plans and agency plans from Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Information for the model plan was drawn from *A Guide for Affirmative Action* (November 1972) by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and *Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity* (January 1974) by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Information on the State plans was provided by the State departments of personnel or the State merit systems. Information about agency plans was supplied by the individual agencies. State and agency responses to the Advisory Committee's analysis in appendix B appear in footnotes to the State chapters (chapters 3 to 6) and in the appendix to chapter 4.

STATE AND AGENCY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS COMPARED TO A MODEL PLAN

Source: Agency Affirmative Action Plans

TASK	TECHNIQUE
I. COMPARE MANPOWER POOL WITH EMPLOYED WORK FORCE	1. Obtain information on available labor force from the State job service. 2. Determine racial and sex composition of each sub-unit of the agency. If there are a large number of employees, determine within each sub-unit by job category. Determine for both the rank and salary held. 3. Compare the data obtained in 2 with that in 1. Are there obvious disparities? Is there underutilization within any group analyzed? 4. If there is underutilization: a. analyze what the causes are; b. set long term goals based upon elimination of the underutilization; c. set short term goals based upon expected vacancies and the availability of persons to fill those vacancies—as indicated by the State job service and other sources; d. determine what actions might be taken that would reduce underutilization.
Iowa Agencies	
Education (Department of Public Instruction)	Plan compares department work force to labor force. DPI exceeds the minimum but states its intention to do better, so far as minority persons are concerned. It is below minimum in the employment of women and intends to increase the proportion of senior level women.
Social Services	Plan indicates that the department will both compare staff to available pool and devise goals to correct deficiencies. It proposes to keep data on existing staff to facilitate this. Both of these actions are taken at the recommendation of the affirmative action committee.
Job Service (Employment Security Commission)	The original plan reports the data but does not analyze it. An update analyzes the existing work force but makes no comparison between that and the available State labor force.
Crime Commission	Plan does analyze work force by comparison with available labor force, albeit somewhat broadly.
Secretary of State	No plan.
Banking Commission	No plan.
State	No plan, merely executive order prohibiting discrimination.
Kansas Agencies	
Education	Department reports goals and timetables have been set based on an analysis of utilization conducted in June 1977.
Social and Rehabilitative Services	SRS states: 1. Information has been obtained on the census data for all counties from the State Division of Labor. 2. The semi-annual report, "Employee Analysis By Job Category and Classification," discloses by race and sex the work force of the Department. The EEO category and salary are identified in the State Personnel Division book on Civil Service Salary Ranges. 3. The Workforce Analysis is usually based on the quarterly Consolidated Employee Report, table VII. 4. Underutilizations are studied. We specifically look at recruitment efforts, applicant flow data, and frequency of vacancies. Long and short range plans are then made toward remedying such underutilizations.

Job Services	Specifies goals and timetables. Notes the numbers in the work force and labor force and analyzes implications.
Department of Administration	No action specified.
Water Resources Board	Comparison of work force and labor force shows no action is necessary.
Credit Unions	No plan.
State	Leaves analysis to each agency.
Missouri Agencies	
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Proposes to conduct a utilization analysis based on quarterly reports. The report contained in the plan indicated a disparity at the administrative and professional levels between staff and work force. No goals are specified.
Social Services	Compares work force available in each county to staffing patterns. No goals are specified.
Job Service (portion of Department of Labor and Industrial Relations)	Comparison made between work force and staffing patterns based on U.S. Department of Labor Form ETA–451. Goals are indicated.
Transportation	No plan.
Conservation	Plan calls for division by division analysis of work force to determine underutilization of women and minorities. No stated goals and timetables.
Natural Resources	Reports work force and staffing patterns but makes no comparison. No goals or timetables.
State	Personnel: State personnel department will supply data but not do any analysis. Governor: Each department director is to conduct a complete utilization study and develop appropriate goals and timetables.
Nebraska Agencies	
Education	Agency will provide a complete analysis of its work force by comparison with the labor force showing underutilization by both group and salary.
Public Welfare	No action. (It seems plan has not been updated since 1972.)
Job Service	Plans for change in work force focus on the unemployment insurance division. No specific comparison between work force and manpower pool. Utilizes ETA–451.
Health	No action.
Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice	No action.
Insurance Commission	No plan.
State	No action.
II. ANALYZE ENTRY LEVEL ROLES	Are the entry level roles' requirements appropriate? Could they be pitched lower? Could jobs be divided to create more entry level roles at lower levels than now postulated? Would restructuring benefit both the agency and underutilized classes? If so, plan to restructure jobs.
Iowa Agencies	
Education	No action.
Social Services	Agency proposes to review classes and requirements for entry level jobs.
Job Service	Agency makes a general commitment to increase the range of entry level classes.

Crime Commission	No action.
Secretary of State	No plan.
Banking Commission	No plan.
State	No plan.
Kansas Agencies	
Education	In June 1977 the department decided, in principle, to establish trainee positions.
Social and Rehabilitative Services	Has begun training staff to identify problems.
Job Service	Complains that entry exams have not been validated. Proposes to revise job requirements, especially those involving education or work experience.
Department of Administration	Proposes to minimize entry level requirements.
Water Resources Board	Proposes to revise job descriptions.
Credit Unions	No plan.
State	Proposes to establish special trainee classes for all entry level positions. Departments can request personnel division to redesignate positions so that this becomes possible. The division will assist in recruitment of minority personnel for these slots.
Missouri Agencies	
Education	No analysis.
Social Services	No analysis.
Job Service	Proposes to use "employment service aide" and "employment service deputy I" positions to facilitate entry into the service.
Transportation	No plan.
Conservation	No action indicated.
Natural Resources	Proposes to introduce entry level career ladders as openings occur.
State	General comments—no specific proposals.
Nebraska Agencies	
Education	The affirmative action officer (AAO) is to be involved in the classification review procedure.
Public Welfare	Remove all unnecessary restrictions.
Job Service	None.
Health	None.
Criminal Justice	None.
Insurance	No plan.
State	None.

III. CAREER LADDER OPPORTUNITIES

1. Identify barriers, both formal and informal.
2. Identify requirements and procedures for upward mobility. Do these have a disparate effect on protected groups?
3. To what extent do improper considerations affect upward mobility? Can alternate procedures be devised? (Ensure that factors which adversely affect protected classes do not dominate upward mobility selections.)
4. Ensure that affected classes get promoted proportionately to their share of the work force of the agency, both by order to supervisory personnel and by establishing a tracking procedure.

5. Identify affected class employees currently qualified for upward mobility and ensure that such employees are considered first when openings become available.
6. Establish career ladder patterns that ensure opportunities for upward mobility by use of clustering and natural progressions.
7. Establish patterns that prevent dead-ending.

Iowa Agencies

Education	The department is committed to providing training opportunities that will improve performance or opportunities for suitable candidates for upward mobility.
Social Services	No action.
Job Service	No action. Reports it is limited by merit system rules.
Crime Commission	No action.
Secretary of State	No plan.
Banking	No plan.
State	No plan.

Kansas Agencies

Education	In June 1977 the department committed itself to the development of career ladders.
Social and Rehabilitative Services	Training is to be provided to combat the effect of discrimination. Employees are to be made aware of the correlation between training and promotion. Information on the requirements and procedures for upward mobility are available through the department's personnel management section or through the State division of personnel. In the institutions and area offices there are designated staff people who are knowledgeable.
Job Service	No action.
Department of Administration	No action.
Water Resources Board	No action.
Credit Unions	No plan.
State	No action.

Missouri Agencies

Education	No action.
Social Services	Suggests procedures for upward mobility programs for high school graduates.
Job Service	Proposes alternatives to promotional examination for promotion.
Transportation	No plan.
Conservation	No action.
Natural Resources	Proposes to introduce career ladders as posts become available.
State	Personnel: No action indicated—places responsibility on agencies. Governor: Requires each agency to review its job specifications.

Nebraska Agencies

Education	Agency does provide 6 hours of course credit, 3 during work time, for improvement.
Public Welfare	No action.
Job Service	Agency has a general proposal for upgrading, but no concrete arrangements.

Health	No action.
Criminal Justice	No action.
Insurance	No plan.
State	No action.
IV. RECRUITMENT	1. Identify extent of labor force that is from the protected classes by functions and skills capacities. 2. Identify groups able to assist in recruitment of persons from the affected classes. 3. Establish contact with the identified groups on a regular and ongoing basis. 4. Ensure that they are informed of all job vacancies. 5. Make special efforts to inform groups of job vacnacies targeted for protected classes. 6. Revise recruitment procedures to minimize the proportion of candidates who are walk-ins. 7. Revise recruitment procedures to ensure checks on applicant flow. 8. Revise recruitment procedures to eliminate blockages such as hostility to affected classes, real or perceived. 9. Eliminate questions that are improper or illegal from application forms. Train supervisory staff so that they do not ask such questions during oral interviews. 10. Ensure valid testing procedures using criterion validation procedures where possible, content validation where criterion is not possible. 11. Ensure job specifications are the minimum required.
Iowa Agencies	
Education	Department proposes to contact all colleges and universities. It also proposes to expand contact with organizations representing protected classes. It has updated its mailing list, revised its application form and testing procedures, and proposed to train supervisors on interview rules.
Social Services	Proposes nothing specific but does make a general commitment to action.
Job Service	Agency proposes to maintain and increase its contacts with NAACP, League of United Latin American Citizens, American GI Forum, and the Indian Tribal Council.
Crime Commission	Will contact minority and women's organizations.
Secretary of State	No plan.
Banking	No plan.
State	No plan.
Kansas Agencies	
Education	Proposes to set goals for each section for the unclassified personnel. Proposes to contact groups representing affected classes, colleges, and people in the field. Has instructed that where two or more are equally qualified, preference is to be given to minority person.
Social and Rehabilitative Services	EEO will sit in as observer when interviews are conducted. EEO will contact minority and women's groups to get affected classes to take civil service exam.
Job Service	EEO officer will try to recruit minority persons.
Department of Administration	Division of personnel will contact groups representing affected classes.
Water Resources Board	Board will notify all concerned that it will refer minority applicants and publicize the affirmative action program of the agency.
Credit Unions	No plan.

State	Division of personnel will contact groups representing affected classes.
Missouri Agencies	
Education	Proposes to reach minority and women's groups—general statement only. Proposes to use minority group persons to interview minority group persons. Proposes to retain minority members and women's applications to be contacted when future vacancies occur.
Social Services	Notes a need to make a special effort to recruit for the veterans division and the manpower planning council. Relies on traditional groups for applicants.
Job Service	Proposes to arrange for changes in the merit examinations. Uses the job service job bank data. Proposes to contact various minority groups and communities.
Transportation	No plan.
Conservation	Is revising media materials to reflect minority and female participation in the work of the department. Proposes to encourage high school students to obtain the requisite college training. Uses word-of-mouth recruitment. Makes special effort to reach minority and female publications and groups.
Natural Resources	Responsibility left to the State personnel department.
State	Personnel: Contacts schools and colleges with high minority proportions; contacts minority and women's groups. Governor: Orders each agency to develop a recruitment program.
Nebraska Agencies	
Education	Agency will revise recruitment processes so that they are neutral with respect to affected classes. Agency proposes to expand efforts to reach groups representing affected classes and provide more information to them about available jobs.
Public Welfare	Agency will furnish literature to groups representing affected classes and maintain contact with schools and colleges containing substantial proportions of persons from affected classes.
Job Service	No specific action.
Health	Agency proposes to coordinate its action with merit systems but makes only general proposals for better recruitment by agency.
Criminal Justice	No independent action. Agency relies on State personnel department.
Insurance	No plan.
State	State proposes to make better use of a list of groups representing affected classes.
V. RETENTION	1. Implement formalized grievance procedure with an appeal to an impartial group outside the agency in addition to inhouse remedies. 2. Ensure work schedules allow maximum opportunities for women with children to work. 3. Policies involving layoffs, discharge, and demotion must not have discriminatory impact. 4. Provide training for supervisors on affirmative action policies and human relations. 5. Provide adequate personnel counseling. 6. Ensure that new facilities do not, by their location, discriminate against protected classes' employment opportunities by making difficult access to housing, transportation, day care, etc. 7. Establish exit interview procedures to monitor possible discrimination.

8. Provide inservice and special education opportunities that will allow employees from protected classes to acquire the skills necessary for upward mobility.
9. Ensure that social, professional, and athletic associations associated with the agency are fully desegregated
10. Provide full maternity benefits and ample leave.

Iowa Agencies	
Education	The department proposes to establish human relations training for supervisors. Its grievance mechanisms include both inhouse appeal and appeal to the Iowa Civil Rights Commission.
Social Services	The department provides a simplified grievance procedure for affirmative action complaints. It has set up human relations training for supervisors. It has established affirmative action committees.
Job Service	The department proposes to establish an affirmative action complaints procedure that goes through the equal employment opportunity officer.
Crime Commission	The commission proposes to establish a complaints/grievance procedure.
Secretary of State	No plan.
Banking	No plan.
State	No plan.
Kansas Agencies	
Education	In-channel grievance procedure. Proposes annual review of classification scheme to ensure affected classes have equal opportunity. Policy to encourage promotion wherever possible. Requires an exit interview.
Social and Rehabilitative Services	Each division director ordered to appoint an EEO representative. EEO officer involved in the complaint process, where appropriate.
Job Service	Proposes to examine how successful units have retained staff to serve as a model for others.
Department of Administration	No action.
Water Resources Board	Prior to termination, make every effort to upgrade employee skills to the minimum required level for the post.
Credit Unions	No plan.
State	No action.
Missouri Agencies	
Education	The agency proposes to create human relations councils, increase efforts to promote from within, and help employees who are performing below standard to reach level of adequacy.
Social Services	The agency proposes to create a complex grievance procedure.
Job Service	The agency proposes alternate promotion ladders to aid retention.
Transportation	No plan.
Conservation	The agency proposes to establish both a grievance committee and an advisory committee on human relations to work on the AAP.
Natural Resources	The agency proposes an audit of opportunities. It would create an advisory committee to advise on problems in the affirmative action program, on methods for dealing with those problems, and on establishment of an effective grievance procedure.

State	Personnel: Proposes establishment of grievance procedures and human relations committees. Specific action is left to the agencies. Governor: Orders agencies to review all aspects of employment for possible discrimination.
Nebraska Agencies	
Education	Agency proposes to promote from within to the extent possible. Establishes a complex grievance procedure. Establishes an affirmative action advisory committee.
Public Welfare	Establishes a grievance procedure.
Job Service	A very good training manual for supervisors on equal opportunity.
Health	Establishes a grievance procedure.
Criminal Justice	No action.
Insurance	No plan.
State	No action.
VI. EVALUATION	1. Devise an evaluation strategy that will adequately monitor all aspects of the affirmative action program including counts of minority and female employees, measures of change, and measures that quantify the pace of change. 2. Records should be kept of all job applicants, the impact of different phases in the recruitment process, the impact of on-job experience, and promotional opportunities afforded persons in protected classes. 3. Qualitative reviews should also be undertaken to assess what might be done to improve performance.
Iowa Agencies	
Education	Proposes to collect relevant data.
Social Services	Proposes a statistical review, but had no specific methods of evaluation.
Job Service	Proposes a quarterly review of statistics, exit interview, and collection of data.
Crime Commission	Proposes to collect data.
Secretary of State	No plan.
Banking	No plan.
State	No plan, but agencies are required to file a report with the Iowa Civil Rights Commission.
Kansas Agencies	
Education	An affirmative action report must accompany each appointment request. Proposed to monitor applicant flow.
Social and Rehabilitative Services	EEO officer to have access to all exams and data. EEO officer to file reports. These include a quarterly report to the State EEO office covering the whole range of EEO concerns.
Job Service	Supervisors are required to file a written explanation for their failure to reach proposed goals.
Department of Administration	Make use of EEO director's applicant flow, staff data, and exit interview procedures, as implemented statewide.
Water Resources Board	No action.
Credit Unions	No plan.
State	Proposes to create exit interview, monitor applicant flow, and collect actual employment data.

Missouri Agencies

Education	None specified other than review of numbers.
Social Services	In addition to data collection on numbers of employees, proposes to review the performance of division directors and office managers based on their affirmative action efforts.
Job Service	None indicated.
Transportation	No plan.
Conservation	No action.
Natural Resources	Not specific; does plan to keep track of numbers of minority and female employees.
State	Personnel: Relies on agencies. Governor: All agencies and department of administration are to develop comprehensive evaluation procedures.

Nebraska Agencies

Education	The affirmative action officer is charged with duty of preparing the department's annual report on success. Agency requires appointing staff to complete an "applicant not hired" form.
Public Welfare	No action.
Job Service	Data collected; methods to be specified later.
Health	General review; no specifics.
Crime Commission	Agency proposes to review nonhires.
Insurance	No plan.
State	No action.

VII. RESPONSIBILITY

1. Overall responsibility should rest with the chief executive officer of the agency.
2. An affirmative action officer should have responsibility for day to day operation of the plan with access to the chief executive when problems arise.
3. Line supervisors should be responsible for implementation within the areas of their authority. This should be measured by including such action within the performance evaluation of the supervisor.
4. To announce that affirmative action is everyone's business is a laudible sentiment, but without specific assignment of responsibility it is also a meaningless one.

Iowa Agencies

Education	Responsibility is divided between personnel and the training branch.
Social Services	Responsibility assigned to the EEO officer.
Job Service	Overall responsibility given to the EEO officer. Personnel is instructed to assist the EEO officer and to review findings. Local managers are given responsibility for action in their offices.
Crime Commission	Authority is varied, shared at a number of levels. Prime responsibility rests with the EEO officer, the director, and the training officer.
Secretary of State	No plan.
Banking	No plan.
State	No plan.

Kansas Agencies

Education	All administrative and supervisory personnel are responsible for implementation. The EEO officer, who is also the director of personnel services, has been given specific authority for planning and monitoring the program. The officer is also to provide appropriate EEO training and counseling.
Social and Rehabilitative Services	The chief executive insists that the AAP be implemented. He delegates enforcement to the EEO officer.
Job Service	Administration by the EEO officer.
Department of Administration	The EEO officer evaluates supervisors on their affirmative action efforts once per year. Agency heads are to issue appropriate statements. The EEO officer is responsible for setting departmental goals.
Water Resource Boards	No action.
Credit Unions	No plan.
State	State EEO director is to evaluate department supervisors annually on their affirmative action efforts. Agency heads are to issue appropriate statements and frame departmental programs. EEO coordinator is responsible for departmental goals and timetables.

Missouri Agencies

Education	While commissioner assumes overall responsibility, he vests most power in personnel and the division heads.
Social Services	Division directors have formal responsibility to communicate policy. The chief human relations officer is responsible to the department director for overall implementation.
Job Service	Administration and supervisory staff are to ensure implementation. Human relations officer is responsible for data, planning, training, monitoring, etc.
Transportation	No plan.
Conservation	Responsibility is shared by personnel, the equal employment opportunity officer, and the department director.
Natural Resources	Division directors are responsible for affirmative action when the opportunity exists. They will be held accountable by the department director for their actions in this regard.
State	Personnnel: For actions by the State personnel division, responsibility lies ultimately with its director. Coordination is delegated to the equal opportunity specialist; compliance to the technical function section heads. However, overall responsibility rests with the merit agencies, not personnel. Governor: Department of administration, agency heads, division of personnel share responsibilities.

Nebraska Agencies

Education	Affirmative action officer responsible to the commissioner for the administration of the AAP.
Public Welfare	Responsibility lies with the personnel and training division.
Job Service	Responsibility is shared by the line supervisor, EEO officer, training officer, and personnel officer.
Health	Responsibility delegated to the personnel officer.
Criminal Justice	Deputy director, administration has responsibility and also prepares the annual report.
Insurance	No plan.
State	Responsibility delegated to the agency heads.